

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 606

SP 014 538

AUTHOR Taylor, Nancy, Ed.
 TITLE Program Validation: Four Case Studies. A Brief Report on Four Projects and Their Experiences Before the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.
 INSTITUTION Network of Innovative Schools, Inc., Andover, Mass.
 SECNS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 78
 NOTE 90p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS *Educational Finance; Educational Programs; Elementary Education; *Eligibility; Endowment Funds; Exceptional Child Education; *Federal Aid; Financial Support; Learning Disabilities; Preschool Education; *Program Validation
 IDENTIFIERS *Joint Dissemination Review Panel; National Diffusion Network Programs

ABSTRACT

In an effort to clearly illustrate the most effective approach when seeking Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) validation, this report describes four different educational programs. A program involving prekindergarten special students, and a project entailing a systems approach for disadvantaged elementary school students, were awarded validation. The other two programs were not. As a result, the Early Childhood Center (Ashland, Massachusetts) is no longer in existence; however, the U-SAIL project in Utah revised its presentation to JDRP, was awarded funding, and is currently an operative program. These four case studies provide step-by-step instruction in establishing eligibility for federal funding via JDRP. In addition to financial support, validation ensures a high profile on the national educational scene. This further benefit is also explored through the case studies. A listing of the members of the JDRP, a project application form, fact sheets on the four case studies, regulations of the National Diffusion Network, a list of the State Facilitator Projects, 1977-78, and a list of Development-Demonstrator Projects, 1977-78, are all appended. (LH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

PROGRAM VALIDATION: FOUR CASE STUDIES

SP

ED174606

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Ford III

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 014538

A Publication of The NETWORK

PROGRAM VALIDATION: FOUR CASE STUDIES

A Brief Report on Four Projects
and Their Experiences
Before The Joint Dissemination Review Panel

By
The Staff of The NETWORK

For additional information about this and
other NETWORK products, please write:

Dr. David P. Crandall
Executive Director
The NETWORK
290 S. Main St.
Andover, Ma. 01810

Copyright © 1978 by The NETWORK

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information, storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

The material printed herein are the expressions of the writers and are not necessarily a statement of policy of The NETWORK.

Acknowledgements

Publication of this booklet was the responsibility of John J. Ford III, Coordinator of Communications and Product Development Division of The NETWORK. Final editing of the manuscript and production management was handled by Nancy Taylor and technical production by Frances Brooks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	7
The Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP)	13
How it Operates	
Its Relationship to the National Diffusion Network (NDN)	
Validate or Reject: Disposition of Four Applications Before the JDRP	
Regional Early Childhood Education and Resource Center Ashland, Massachusetts	25
Project SHARE Crookston, Minnesota	35
U-SAIL Jordan, Utah	43
Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching Program Fargo, North Dakota	61
Submitting an Application to the JDRP: Thoughts and Observations	69
APPENDICES: A -- Members of the Joint Dissemination Review Panel	75
B -- Application Form for JDRP Review	77
C-F -- Fact Sheets on the Four Projects	79
G -- The National Diffusion Network Final Regulations (from the <i>Federal Register</i> , 1/5/77)	87
H -- List of State Facilitator Projects 1977-78	93
I -- List of Developer-Demonstrator Projects 1977-78	99

Introduction

INTRODUCTION

This booklet, now in its second edition, illustrates how new educational programs whose developmental costs were underwritten with federal funds are approved for dissemination to local schools. It presents the experiences of four projects for whom such approval was sought from an inter-agency committee in the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare called the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP).

The JDRP is composed of upper echelon program managers and other personnel from the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) with expert knowledge of evaluation and social science methodology. On the basis of evidence submitted to it in a ten-page application, the JDRP determines if an educational program is effective in achieving desired student outcomes -- if, in other words, students learn what the program purports to teach them.

To a project director and staff, a favorable decision by the JDRP represents confirmation of years of hard work and commitment to the goal of developing an effective program. It represents "validation" of their program. But more than that, a favorable decision enables the National Diffusion Network (NDN) and other dissemination programs of USOE and NIE to alert educators throughout the country that the validated program -- judged as being effective by the JDRP -- is now available for adoption. And it enables the project to apply for federal funds to meet the expense of disseminating information about the program and training teachers and administrators in other locations in its use. In short, approval by the JDRP propels a project onto the national education scene.

Each project described here was supported by funds authorized under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, which provided for the development of exemplary programs at the local school level. (Title III was subsumed under Title IV, Part C, by the Educational Amendments of 1974, and continues to be administered by USOE.) Two projects received JDRP validation of their programs' effectiveness claims. One was a project in Fargo, North Dakota, that developed a program for disadvantaged, pre-kindergarten children with learning disabilities. The other, a project in Crookston, Minnesota, devised a systems approach to special education for children, K-8. Upon the evidence before them, the JDRP refused to validate the other two projects. For the Early Childhood Center in Ashland, Massachusetts, that decision effectively marked the end of the project.

In contrast, Project U-SAIL (Utah Systems Approach to Individualized Learning) continued its work and eventually, after making a second presentation to the JDRP, was validated and received federal funding for nationwide dissemination.

These four projects were chosen for study for several reasons. First and most obvious, two were approved and two rejected in the initial JDRP review, so the project directors have different perspectives on the experience. Secondly, the project directors were willing to talk candidly and openly about their experiences, which, for the two unsuccessful directors, must have been somewhat painful. Finally, travel arrangements for conducting on-site interviews could be made in the time available to complete this project.

A word of caution. This study does not claim to be conclusive. Nor does it contrast and compare the experiences of the four projects in order to answer the question of why two projects succeeded in obtaining validation and two failed. Instead, the four cases should be read as discrete experiences in which similarities occur only because the projects complied with the same administrative procedures in seeking JDRP approval. The NETWORK does, however, offer some concluding observations about preparing for JDRP review which it believes should be instructive to future applicants.

We wish to thank each project director for the time and patience accorded our interviewers, who had to be led through the history of each project in order to write knowledgeably about its JDRP experience.

The directors and their projects are:

Dr. Carma Hales, Project U-SAIL
Dr. Marvin Hammerback, Project SHARE
Dr. Robert Hunton, Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching
Ms. Joan Little, Early Childhood Education Center

We also acknowledge the support and cooperation of Dr. Frank Giuliano, Superintendent, Franklin (Massachusetts) Public Schools, and the Franklin School Committee.

In the two years since the first edition was published, there have been some changes in JDRP procedures. These are incorporated in this edition. We also corrected some errors and omissions that our readers were considerate enough to point out and made a few other editorial changes. The result is, we trust, an up-to-date and useful document.

Finally, we take great pleasure in including in this second edition further information on Project U-SAIL, which, upon submitting evidence of its effectiveness for the second time, received validation from the JDRP in October, 1976, by a unanimous vote. The difference between the first application and the second, successful application is discussed in the chapter on U-SAIL for the benefit of those who would like to learn from an unsuccessful attempt -- as U-SAIL itself did.

Although a number of NETWORK staff members contributed to the development of both editions, I would particularly like to acknowledge the work of two -- Dennis E. Collins, who guided the effort from conceptualization through various drafts and final production; and Richard A. Bumstead, who held the major writing responsibility, particularly for the second edition.

David P. Crandall, Ed.D.
Executive Director

First Edition
August 1975

Second Edition
September 1977

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP)

How it Operates

Its Relationship to the
National Diffusion Network (NDN)

Validate or Reject: Disposition of
Four Applications Before the JDRP

EDITOR'S NOTE: Just prior to publication of this book, the chairmanship of the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) was reassumed by Dr. John Evans from the Office of Education. Dr. Evans, who was the first chairman of the JDRP from 1973 to 1976, replaces Dr. Lois-ellin Dalta from the National Institute of Education, who has served in that position for the past two years. The chairmanship of the JDRP regularly rotates between the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education.

In the last decade, the federal government has invested more than a billion dollars in the development of programs designed to improve the quality of education in the United States.

For example, education labs and centers authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) have produced literally hundreds of programs and practices. Title III of ESEA (now Part C, Title IV) provided funds for the development of thousands of innovative programs at the local school level. New reading and math programs for disadvantaged children have been generated with Title I funds. Model programs for educating learning disabled children, authorized by Title VI-G, P.L. 91-230, have evolved to the point where they can now be offered to schools for adoption. Seven years of federal funding for bilingual education (Title VII of ESEA) has given rise to hundreds of programs in this area. In fact, very few subjects in an elementary or secondary curriculum have not been enriched by programs developed with federal funds.

The task now confronting the National Institute of Education (NIE) and the U.S. Office of Education (USOE), the two agencies that comprise the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is to move these new programs from the labs and centers and school development sites into other schools that need them.

As a measure of the importance of this task, NIE allocated \$15.7 million, or 17% of its total budget for fiscal year 1976, to support dissemination activities. It currently funds several nationwide projects designed to develop an effective strategy for introducing new educational programs and packages into schools so they will become an integral part of a school's curriculum and not a passing fancy. NIE, as well as USOE, learned firsthand that merely announcing a new program does not generate either acceptance or demand.

To disseminate new programs, USOE has organized the National Diffusion Network (NDN). It is a delivery system that presents information and provides technical assistance to local school systems -- both public and private -- so they may adopt exemplary elementary and secondary education, early childhood, or adult education programs, products and practices that have been developed with federal funds.

The Need for Quality Control

Many educational programs supported by federal funds are on the cutting edge of curriculum development. They often attempt to meet, for the first time, educational needs that have gone unrecognized. The fact that USOE or NIE pays for the development of

these programs does not automatically insure they will be effective, workable, or affordable. The assistance, monitoring, and evaluation efforts of the funding agencies during the projects' developmental phases can aid them in moving towards successful outcomes. Still, some programs attain their goals, others do not; and the problem is how to distinguish the effective programs from the rest.

This kind of judgment is complicated by a sense of ownership that arises in a USOE or NIE program officer after years of guiding an educational program through its developmental phase. One becomes associated with a program professionally and is more likely to advance claims about its effectiveness that are founded as much on a familiarity with its features and its staff as they are upon rigorous evaluation.

This tendency was recognized in a document issued March 1, 1977, by the Education Division on the JDRP's history, purposes, and procedures:

Eagerness on the part of Federal officials to disseminate exemplary educational methods has not always been matched by assurance that the items disseminated were in fact exemplary. Federal program staffs have disseminated materials which seemed innovative, intriguing, or which enjoyed a good reputation in the schools where they were utilized. Seldom was it determined that such products were supported by objective evidence of effectiveness. State and local educators have been persuaded by Federal sponsorship to implement practices which have not produced their promised results.

The Federal Government is irresponsible if it does not take steps to assure that the educational materials it disseminates are backed by objective evidence of effectiveness.

The JDRP: What it Does

Although a dissemination review process was originally conceived by the Education Division as a joint USOE-NIE activity, the agencies initially established separate procedures. In 1973, the Dissemination Review Panel (DRP) was formed, composed of nine high-level USOE program officers. Its basic function was to review claims of effectiveness presented by program officers from USOE on behalf of programs that were developed under its sponsorship. NIE concurrently implemented its own review process.

In 1975, the Education Division combined the two actions into the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP), a 22-member body comprised equally of staff members from USOE and NIE. Its function has continued as originally conceived -- to assess the adequacy of a program's effectiveness data -- now to include those programs developed with support from either agency. If the JDRP concludes, on the basis of the evidence presented to them in an application, that an educational program is indeed effective -- that it works -- then the program is said to be "validated."

Unless a program is validated by the JDRP, it cannot be disseminated by the NIE or USOE, nor can a staff member of either agency endorse or advocate the use of an educational program that has not been validated. Thus, the JDRP acts as an internal quality control mechanism for the Education Division.

The record indicates that a favorable vote from the JDRP is certainly not *pro forma*. Between its inception in 1973 and Spring 1977, the JDRP had met some 70 times, reviewed about 300 applications for validation, and approved 180 of them, an approval rate of about 60%. Therefore, when an Education Division program office says that some particular educational practice or product is exemplary and worthy of being installed in school systems, that assertion now has something substantial behind it.

Membership

Members of the JDRP are nominated by the Commissioner of Education and the Director of NIE from among their staffs on the basis of their qualifications in evaluation and social science methodology, the programs they represent (to achieve broad program representation within the JDRP), and their position within their agency.

"From the beginning, we sought members from as high a level as possible, so the decisions of the JDRP would carry substantial authority," said John Evans, acting Deputy Commissioner for Planning in USOE and the first chairman of the JDRP. (See Appendix A for a list of current members.)

The chairmanship was assumed in 1976 by an official from NIE, Lois-ellin Datta. Dr. Datta's primary responsibility with NIE is Assistant Director of the Education and Work Group.

Procedures for Submitting an Application to the JDRP

Since the JDRP is a group that serves only the Education Division, it is the responsibility of program officers in USOE or NIE to identify educational programs they believe to be worthy of dissemination and to submit these to the JDRP for validation. A director of a federally-funded project may not apply directly to the JDRP.

As of September 1977, only those products and practices that have been developed by federally-supported programs may be reviewed by the JDRP, even though they may have been copyrighted and published commercially. Proprietary materials not developed with federal funds will not be reviewed by the JDRP unless federal support for their dissemination is sought.

Although the program officer submits the application, the project whose program is to be reviewed by the JDRP usually prepares the application according to guidelines published by the JDRP. In some cases, preparing the application is a joint effort of the program officer and project personnel. (The guidelines are discussed below, with further details included in Appendix B.) *The maximum permissible length of material to cover such submission is 10 single-spaced typed pages, including tables.*

The program officer conducts a pre-review of the application for factual accuracy, consistency and completeness, compliance with program regulations, social fairness, and the absence of any elements that could possibly harm users. The agency may also employ other criteria such as quality of development, user enthusiasm, and conceptual soundness to decide whether to submit the application to the JDRP or to disseminate a program once it has been approved. Some program offices have established an internal review process to preliminarily assess the adequacy of the evaluation design and results as presented. The written information provided to the Panel thus reflects the combined knowledge of the program officer, regarding Panel expectations and the project personnel, concerning the program and its outcomes.

Normally, when a minimum of three applications are pending, the chair calls a meeting of the Panel, allowing at least five working days for the members to review each application.

The JDRP asks that the NIE or USOE officer sponsoring the program appear at the meeting to answer questions and otherwise clarify points that may not be adequately presented in the application. The director of the program under review, the evaluator who collected the evidence of program effectiveness, and any member of the project staff may accompany the program officer to the meeting, and may participate in the proceedings if called upon.

Seven members of the JDRP, with at least three from each agency, constitute a quorum. Voting is by closed ballot, although each member's vote is announced and recorded in the minutes. A simple majority of those members present decides the issue.

All meetings are open to the public, and all records -- the application, the minutes of the meeting, the decision on the application, including reasons for disapproval -- are public records, open to inspection. Some project directors have found it advantageous to attend a meeting so they can gain an understanding of the kind of evidence and the form of presentation that seems most persuasive. "One man from a

Western state came to a meeting to watch the JDRP review two of his projects," said the executive secretary of the JDRP. "They were rejected, but he learned how to improve their chances the next time from an excellent presentation of a third project."

The Criteria for Judging Effectiveness

Three questions guide the deliberations of the JDRP when it reviews an educational program:

- * is there sufficient evidence that anything important happened that is consistent with the claims made by the program?
- * can the outcome be attributed to the program?
- * is the outcome generalizable to other school districts?

These criteria are further explained in the most recent document (3/1/77) describing the purpose, procedures, and criteria that govern the actions of the JDRP. The section relating to criteria is quoted here at length. Further explanation can be found on the Form for Submitting Materials to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (10/12/76), which is included in this booklet in Appendix B.

Here, then, is what JDRP members look for in the application when judging the effectiveness of a program:

1. How well did the children perform before they were subject to the product or practice in question, and how well did they perform after experiencing it? As an example, are there measures taken before and after the children experienced the product which show that they gained or improved?
2. Are the gains statistically reliable?
3. If there is evidence of change or improvement, is the gain large enough to be meaningful? That is, is it large enough to be both statistically reliable and educationally significant? Many submissions submitted to the panel do show apparent before-after mean changes in the expected direction, but they are either not statistically reliable or, even if statistically reliable, are too small in size to constitute meaningful educational improvement judged against commonly available experience.
4. Is there evidence that the improvements registered by the product or practice are stable and generalizable to other school settings? Or does it appear that they may be the result of special characteristics of the particular group of students who happened to use the product or practice when it was evaluated or the unusual competence of the teacher who used it. These considerations are acute when the number of children is small or where there is only a single use of the product, e.g., where the evidence is based on one teacher and one classroom. Thus, it is desirable when the number of cases is small, for there to have been multiple replications of the practice (e.g., different classrooms, different teachers, different schools, or different years).
5. Once it has been established that there have been gains, that they are large enough to be statistically and educationally meaningful, and that they are generalizable beyond the originating site, the central question remains: can we be reasonably confident that the gains can be attributed to the product or practice described in the submission rather than to normal maturation, the regular education process, or other special factors which may be impacting on the students? In order to provide some kind of answer to this crucially

important question, submissions to the Panel should include some measure or estimate of what would have happened to the children if they had not been using the product or practice. The best way to do this, of course, is through a control group, but the Panel has approved many projects which did not contain a control group because the evidence of effectiveness contained some other persuasive measure or estimate of the effects of non-treatment. For example, comparisons of recent gains with previous year's scores or national norms often provide very persuasive evidence that the unusually large gains recorded can reasonably be attributed to the product or practice. Another example is time series comparisons against a baseline time period. In many cases, however, simple before-after data on the user groups are likely to be ambiguous when there are no parallel data on a comparable, untreated control group.

The idea is to provide evidence ruling out rival hypotheses (factors which may be responsible for producing the effects attributed to the product or practice). Examples of rival hypotheses are:

- maturation -- psychological or physiological changes in the users.
- history -- events or administrative procedures which occurred in addition to the product or practice.
- selection/differential attrition -- when comparison groups are unequal on the relevant measures at the beginning (due to selection) or at the end (due to differential attrition).
- statistical regression -- e.g., when groups which are selected for their initial extreme scores on a given measure fall closer to their population mean score on retesting with the same measure.
- test effects -- increases in test scores due to the learning that results from frequent use of the same test, or to teaching to the test.

In reviewing the evidence, JDRP members do not employ precise specifications such as a 1.0 grade level gain or a minimum sample size of 50 students. "The decision as to whether the evidence of effectiveness on any particular product or practice is adequate to justify use of federal funds to promote dissemination is not automatic or mechanical," state the JDRP guidelines. "This decision involves judgment about the educational significance of the claimed effect and the credibility of the evidence supporting the claimed results."

"A decision that the evidence is not convincing is usually not due to a single fatal flaw, but to a failure of plausibility on several criteria."

The JDRP guidelines suggest that project directors and evaluators consult the following two volumes when designing an evaluation plan for a program:

G. Kasten Tallmadge, Donald P. Horst and Christine T. Wood, *A Practical Guide to Measuring Project Impact on Student Achievement*. Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, Stock Number 017-080-01460-2, \$1.90.

G. Kasten Tallmadge and Donald P. Horst, *A Procedural Guide for Validating Achievement Gains in Educational Projects*, Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, Stock Number 017-080-01516-1, \$2.10.

In addition, the following document may provide further guidance in preparing for JDRP review:

G. Kasten Tallmadge, *The Joint Dissemination Review Panel IDEABOOK*. Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. OR Contact the JDRP Chairperson (Appendix A) or your area State Facilitator (Appendix H).

The Second Chance

According to JDRP procedures, a program not approved on first submission may apply again at any time. The Crookston, Minnesota project was reviewed three times before its program was finally approved. Project U-SAIL succeeded on its second try. Both projects amended their submissions in response to questions raised by JDRP members, and to the reasons for disapproval recorded in the minutes.

Why do projects seek validation of their programs with such persistence? First, a favorable decision by the JDRP, whose members are knowledgeable yet impartial, confirms what the project said it had accomplished -- the development of an effective program. For all those professionally involved, this affirmation of their work is no small tribute.

Secondly, and perhaps more important in terms of extending a project's impact on education, validation by the JDRP is a prerequisite for seeking many federal funds to disseminate a program. With validation, and with federal funding support, the project staff who developed the program can remain together and teach other people how to use it.

The National Diffusion Network

The National Diffusion Network (NDN), a program of USOE, illustrates how the JDRP is utilized to identify effective educational programs that are subsequently offered to schools across the country to improve their curriculum. The NDN was launched in 1974 under ESEA Title III, Section 306 as one of the first comprehensive national efforts for moving educational programs from the original development site to schools nationwide where the programs could be used. It represented a federal initiative to spread the programmatic results of millions of federal elementary and secondary education dollars to new settings at a fraction of their developmental costs.

Two types of projects constitute the NDN: State Facilitator projects and Developer-Demonstrator projects. A Developer-Demonstrator project receives funds from USOE for the purpose of introducing its program to educators and, if a school elects to install it, for the purpose of training school staff in how to use the program.

However, before a project can attain Developer-Demonstrator status, it must meet two conditions. First, its program must have been validated by the JDRP as required by policy established by the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Secondly, it must present a proposal for disseminating its program that merits federal support. Because funds are limited, USOE cannot grant Developer-Demonstrator

status to all projects whose programs have been approved by the JDRP and it therefore must choose those projects whose programs meet a pressing national education need and whose dissemination plans are sound.

A State Facilitator project is the linking agent between the Developer-Demonstrator projects and the local school district. It informs school districts about the existence of Developer-Demonstrator projects whose programs can be adopted; it helps school districts match their needs with programs available; it arranges for program demonstrations and staff training if a school elects to adopt a program; and, in many cases, it provides ongoing technical assistance during the first few months to those schools adopting a program.

During the second year of its operation, the NDN had a national resource pool of 65 Developer-Demonstrator projects. Their programs were being introduced to local school districts through 77 State Facilitator projects in 36 states (several states were served by more than one facilitator project). As a result of their combined efforts, nearly 2,000 school districts across the country had begun improving their curriculum by installing these new programs.

When FY 1977 appropriations for the Education Division were reviewed by Congress in the spring of 1976, several directors of State Facilitator and Developer-Demonstrator projects testified before a House appropriations sub-committee on the accomplishments of the NDN and its potential benefit for education in the coming years. After a thorough examination of the NDN's contribution to education, Congress eventually appropriated \$7.5 million for its continuance during FY 1978. The U.S. Office of Education issued final regulations calling for proposals for Developer-Demonstrator and State Facilitator projects in the January 5, 1977, issue of the *Federal Register*. (See Appendix G.) Proposals were due in March, with contracts let July 1 to resume full services through the 1977-78 school year. The results of this competition added nineteen Developer-Demonstrator projects to the resource pool, for a total of 81. Eleven states joined the State Facilitator group, bringing their number to 62 in 45 states. The District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands also received State Facilitator funding this year, for a total of 64. (The total number of State Facilitators decreased despite the new additions because some states formerly having multiple State Facilitator projects, housed in their regional education service centers, established more centralized services this

year under one agency -- their state department of education.) The Developer-Demonstrator and State Facilitator projects receiving federal support under the National Diffusion Network for the 1977-78 school year are listed in Appendices H and I.

Two projects described in this booklet -- Project SHARE, from Crookston, Minnesota, and the Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching Program, from Fargo, North Dakota, applied for, and received, Developer-Demonstrator status and federal funds to disseminate their programs after the JDRP had declared their programs to be effective.

Both programs are listed in *Educational Programs That Work*, a catalog of all JDRP-approved projects. This catalog contains a description of each approved program, the materials used, target audience, financial requirements, program evaluation, services available from the Developer-Demonstrator regarding adoption, and the name of the contact person. A limited supply of the catalog's third edition, including projects validated by the JDRP as of August 1, 1976, is available, and it may be ordered from the Order Department, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, California 94103, for \$4.95 (pre-paid). A fourth edition, including entries on projects approved since then, will be available early in 1978. For interim information on the new programs and source information on the catalog's fourth edition, contact the State Facilitator in your area (see Appendix H) or the Dissemination Unit, U.S. Office of Education, FOB6, 400 Maryland Avenue S.W., Room 2031, Washington, D.C. 20202.

IVD -- A State Validation Program

It is worth repeating that the JDRP is an internal quality control mechanism for the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It serves program officers in NIE and USOE who must make decisions about which education programs developed under those funding sources to disseminate nationally. Its judgments are not intended to affect dissemination programs of state or local education agencies.

Still, most state education agencies confront the same question: which education programs developed within their borders are effective programs and therefore worth disseminating to local school districts?

At the time the JDRP was first organized, the Division of Supplementary Centers and Services in USOE (administrators of ESEA Title III throughout its history) was encouraging state education agencies to use the IVD process (Identification, Validation, Dissemination) for identifying effective Title III projects within their borders whose programs local schools could adopt.

The IVD process, developed by the Division in collaboration with state education agencies, calls for a team of evaluators to conduct an on-site validation of a local project, rendering a judgment about its effectiveness based on what they see there and on data supplied in an extensive IVD application form. School district participation is voluntary. Unlike the JDRP procedure, IVD provides for a firsthand look at an educational program and its effect on students. The validation team examines project evaluation information and other documentation, and interviews project staff to assess the program's success in terms of three criteria: impact on students, cost-effectiveness, and exportability to other school districts. (Details of the IVD process are described in a USOE publication entitled *Sharing Educational Success*, subtitled *A Handbook for Validation of Educational Practices*. It is available in limited quantities from the Division of Educational Replication (formerly the Division of Supplementary Centers and Services), U.S. Office of Education, ROB3, Room 3616, Washington, D.C. 20202.)

Although this is a jointly sponsored USOE-state departments of education program, the decision to employ the IVD process for identifying effective projects remains with the state education agency. Most states are employing the IVD process, or an adaptation of it, as their own internal quality control mechanism. Programs which are successful in receiving IVD validation are eligible to apply for state funding to disseminate their exemplary approach within their borders, and many states offer support to school districts adopting IVD-validated programs. The USOE role in the IVD process continues primarily as the sponsor of the training for validation team members.

The IVD and JDRP processes therefore complement one another in providing avenues for effective programs to achieve statewide and national visibility and support. Many of the programs validated by the JDRP were previously successful in the IVD review process, which better prepared them to pass JDRP scrutiny. (It should be noted, however, that the two procedures are independent, and one is not a prerequisite of the other.)

In fact, three of the projects described in this booklet previously were evaluated under the IVD process and validated for dissemination within their states -- including the U-SAIL project. Since the Massachusetts Department of Education was not then engaging in a formalized internal validation process for its local projects, the Early Childhood Center program did not undergo this evaluation prior to its JDRP experience.

Regional Early Childhood Education and Resource Center

Ashland, Massachusetts

Established in 1971 with a grant from ESEA Title III, the Regional Early Childhood Education and Resource Center provided in-service training for teachers and programs in child-centered education for administrators and parents in nine eastern Massachusetts towns.

These towns -- Stow, Hull, Ashland, Framingham, Hopkinton, Millis, Franklin, Ayer, and Malden -- include various population elements: blue collar, rural, and suburban. Per pupil expenditures fall within the range of \$800-1000 annually.

Project Background

The major goal of the Early Childhood Center (ECC) was to utilize recent advances in educational psychology to improve elementary instruction. This meant, according to the Center, that teachers should abandon complete reliance on teacher-directed, text-book-oriented programs, and move towards more child-centered, activity-oriented programs.

Pilot teachers (those who volunteered to participate in the program) worked closely with a Resource Advisor from the Center. Every week, the Resource Advisor assisted each pilot teacher to identify areas of children's interest, develop new instructional materials, employ more child-centered theories of instruction, use a more individualized evaluation system to keep track of a child's progress, and otherwise create a more open classroom. Together, they planned appropriate activities for the coming weeks. For other teachers in a school, the Resource Advisor conducted workshops and seminars on the open classroom on an *ad hoc* basis.

With a staff that had grown to five Resource Advisors by the third year of the project, the Project Director expanded the training program for teachers, administrators, and community members.

For teachers, full-day workshops were held each month at the Center on humanistic education, curriculum, and classroom management. Pilot teachers participated in a series of three to six week mini-courses in specific curriculum areas.

For administrators and parents, the following activities were implemented to support the objective of moving towards a more child-centered approach to education:

- * Principals of each pilot school formed a Liaison Committee that met monthly to discuss school policies that conflicted with establishing an open classroom environment.
- * Two open classrooms were designated as demonstration classrooms where administrators, parents, and teachers could observe programs in action.
- * The ECC staff presented slide-talks on open education to parents, teachers, administrators, school committees, or other interested groups in the nine towns.

- * Parents of children in the demonstration classes were invited to an informal coffee hour each month.
- * Resource Advisors and pilot teachers conducted evening workshops for parents so they could gain a greater understanding of open education philosophy and the instructional materials used in place of traditional workbooks and texts.

Developing the Evaluation Design

Appointed Project Director in August 1971, Joan Little faced her first major administrative decision -- securing the services of an external evaluator. Ms. Little decided to rely on an outside evaluator because her project staff lacked evaluation skills and she recognized the need for accountability. She chose an educational consulting firm located in Massachusetts with an established reputation for conducting evaluations of Title III projects.

Ms. Little's next concern was that of transforming the concepts in the proposal into a fully operational program that delivered appropriate services to students and faculty in the region. Adopting cognitive and affective objectives for target students was the first step in this process. Performance objectives for the major cognitive areas were derived from the Ashland Curriculum Guide, and instructional materials and learning activities were keyed to them.

The more complex task of developing representative affective objectives was addressed by the entire project staff in a series of meetings. Utilizing a process called the "Operationalization of Fuzzy Concepts," developed by Professors Fortune and Hutchinson of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, the staff came to an agreement on a range of affective objectives, and these were written in operational language.

Evaluation: First Year

Working with the Project Director, the evaluation consultant developed a targeted evaluation program based on the cognitive and affective objectives. It was designed to validate the "open education" approach to instruction in local classrooms, and to measure the effectiveness of the teacher training and other support techniques employed by the project.

The testing program focused on students in the two ECC demonstration classrooms. They were taught by two ECC staff members, each a highly experienced open classroom teacher. Control groups were established in a similar socio-economic area. The educational program for the control students was more conventional, teacher directed, and curriculum oriented.

The ECC staff and the evaluation consultant developed criterion referenced tests to measure academic achievement. The tests contained items that measured reading readiness, reading language skills, basic mathematical concepts and computational skills, science and social studies concepts. The specific skills measured were those commonly found in the curriculum for grades K-3 and considered to be necessary for academic achievement at each grade level by a majority of primary teachers. Thus, item validity was based on an analysis of curriculum requirements, and the skills that teachers thought essential for successfully completing the work. A kindergarten test and a primary test (grades 1 and 2) were used.

Affective growth was measured by an instrument designed by the evaluation consultant in cooperation with the ECC staff. All test instruments measured cognitive or affective growth in terms of a series of behaviorally stated objectives. A proposal to document the program by video tape was rejected on the grounds of inefficiency.

These were the results of the first year's testing:

- * There was no significant difference in cognitive growth between students in the child-centered, open classrooms promoted by ECC and control students in the more conventional classrooms.
- * A significantly greater proportion of students in the ECC classrooms had developed the positive social and affective behaviors that the project was designed to foster.
- * This affective development occurred over a shorter time span than did the same development in control students.

Without considerable investment in developing an evaluation design in the early days of the project, such substantial data on project effectiveness could not have been produced.

Evaluation: Year Two

During ECC's second year, evaluation activities focused on substantiating the premise that positive affective development in students was a direct result of the ECC training program. Further, it was expected that additional evidence would be generated in support of the first year's findings on the positive educational effects of child-centered, open classroom programs.

A random sample of approximately 100 experimental students was drawn from the classes of pilot teachers who had just started their training in September. These students were tested on cognitive and affective measures on a pre-post test basis, and the results compared to a group of control students in a neighboring district who took the same tests.

However, after students had completed the affective pre-testing and most of the cognitive pre-testing, the administrators in the control school abruptly terminated the testing program. The evaluation consultant salvaged some February-June control data by persuading another school to provide control students.

The comparison of experimental students in classrooms of new pilot teachers with control students produced data similar to the first year, although the differences were not as pronounced as those observed when comparing control students to students in ECC demonstration classes. This difference in growth data was due to the factor of experience, the project staff explained. The new pilot teachers were still being trained, and their classes were in an early transition stage. On the other hand, students in the ECC demonstration classes had been taught by experienced open classroom teachers.

When the test results of ECC demonstration class students were compared with control students, the gains in the affective domain supported the first year's findings at a high level of statistical significance. Additionally, evidence produced by the project-developed Kindergarten Criterion Referenced Test indicated that kindergarten students in the child-centered, open classrooms performed better in the cognitive area than those in conventional classes.

On-site Evaluation

In February, 1973, a six-person evaluation team representing the Title III office in the Massachusetts Department of Education conducted a firsthand assessment of the project and filed a report. Noting the excellence of the evaluation design, the evaluation team recommended the following to the Project Director:

- * write a summary of the evaluation report for wider distribution to key decision makers.
- * provide school committees and administrators with a briefing when the next evaluation report is issued.
- * emphasize student gains in the affective domain.
- * involve parents in designing the evaluation process, especially concerning psychosocio development.

The tenor of these recommendations clearly indicated that the evaluation team was satisfied with the data collection and analytical methods employed by the project.

Evaluation: Year Three

A random sample of students was selected to be tested under the same format as before. They were students who had been in the ECC program for one to three years and who had been taught by pilot teachers. The objective was to assess the average number

of years required to move from conventional to child-centered programs when teachers were provided with training and support by ECC.

The evaluation design also included a systematic study of pilot teachers, parents, and administrators. Generally, however, no major changes were incorporated in the evaluation design during the third year, although the Director and staff continued to work with the evaluation consultant to improve evaluation instruments.

Initial Awareness of National Diffusion

During the second year of ECC, Ms. Little learned about national validation and dissemination from the Title III Coordinator, Massachusetts Department of Education, at a meeting of Title III project directors. As an officer of PACE (Projects to Advance Creativity in Education), a statewide organization of Title III project directors, Ms. Little closely followed the efforts of the U.S. Office of Education to implement its state validation and dissemination policy. This was the IVD review -- Identification, Validation, and Dissemination. (See Section I.) However, the Massachusetts Title III staff discouraged project directors from participating in the IVD process, citing apparent lack of financial incentives, the necessity to invest a significant amount of state department and project staff time, the requirement that projects complete lengthy application forms, and an estimated cost of \$1200-1800.

Sensing the potential of the IVD process in terms of future funding and general public relations, Ms. Little tried to persuade her governing board and the Massachusetts Department of Education to cooperate with the U.S. Office of Education on the IVD program, but she was not successful. Consequently, the Early Childhood Center did not benefit from the rigorous on-site examination contained in the validation process.

The issue of diffusion arose again in January, 1974, at a PACE meeting. It was learned that the U.S. Commissioner of Education was considering the use of his Title III discretionary monies (Sec. 306) to mount a national diffusion program during FY 75 and 76. This was confirmed in mid-March at an IVD training session held for validation team members in New England.

Preparing the First Submission to the JDRP

Since the Early Childhood Center was assured of continuing for a fourth year with local funds and grants from the Massachusetts Department of Education to diffuse its program statewide, the project staff began preparing a submission to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP). At stake was the possibility of obtaining additional

funds for the purpose of diffusing the ECC program nationwide, and this justified the expenditure of staff resources to prepare the submission. The Project Director was also motivated by the opportunity to generate a substantial public relations impact at the local level if the Center received a favorable decision from a national review board.

On the basis of a brief proposal, the Early Childhood Center received approval from the appropriate USOE program officer to submit a formal application to the JDRP. It went forward on April 5, 1974. The application was the work of the Project Director, who prepared the narrative sections, and the outside evaluator, who prepared the section on "evidence of effectiveness."

The JDRP Decision

The Joint Dissemination Review Panel reviewed the submission of the Early Childhood Center in early summer. Their deliberations resulted in a rather unusual vote: approved -- 2; denied -- 2; abstained -- 2. Evidently, several members were confused about the meaning of graphic displays in the "evidence of effectiveness" section, according to Nancy Taylor, the USOE Title III Program Officer who sponsored the submission.

However, since the USOE program staff for Title III was impressed by the materials and reports it had seen, and the JDRP's vote was split, the Early Childhood Center was granted \$70,000 as a "Category B" project. This designation, a one-time arrangement devised by USOE in the first year of the National Diffusion Network, allowed a project to collect and analyze additional data, revise its submission for a second review by the JDRP, and develop a diffusion strategy. "Category A" funds were reserved for projects that had passed the JDRP and had submitted proposals to become Developer-Demonstrator projects. "Category B" funds went to projects that had a potential for meeting vital educational needs but whose first applications had been rejected by the JDRP because of missing or unclear data in their validation submission. It seemed reasonable to support such projects, which appeared to have potentially convincing evidence, while they prepared a second, more persuasive application.

Because the staff believed that evidence of effectiveness already existed -- although it required better display to be persuasive -- Ms. Little elected to use most of the Category B funds to develop a national diffusion strategy for the Center's program.

Preparing the Second Submission to the JDRP

Most of the effort was concentrated on rewriting the crucial "evidence of effectiveness" section, since it proved to be the least comprehensible. Additional consultation in program evaluation was provided by Louis Aikman of Boston University, who worked with the evaluation consultant on revisions. A number of evaluation issues were discussed at length in several meetings between the Project Director, the evaluation consultant, and Dr. Aikman. However, the draft of the "evidence of effectiveness" section, written by the evaluation consultant, was deemed inadequate by Dr. Aikman and Ms. Little. It was decided that she would rewrite it.

Dr. Aikman reviewed the draft prepared by Ms. Little and advised her that although the JDRP sought more than a journalistic treatment of conclusions, it certainly demanded less than a full blown research report. In a letter, he suggested that the "evidence of effectiveness" section could be strengthened by:

- * describing the independent variable (classroom instructional elements) in the experimental classrooms in a paragraph at the beginning of the section, followed by a paragraph highlighting the major findings of the evaluation study.
- * briefly describing the research design, including the selection of control groups by number of classes, children, grade levels, and other characteristics.
- * briefly describing the dependent variables (e.g., academic achievement) and the measurement instruments such as the Stanford Achievement Test, the Primary Battery, and various criterion-referenced measures developed by the project staff.
- * presenting summary achievement statistics for year 1 and 2 in tabular form with interpretations and conclusions.
- * presenting a brief introduction to affective measures, and displaying summary statistics and conclusions in a clear, graphic manner.

The JDRP's Decisions on the Second Submission

The resubmission was placed on the JDRP's agenda for February 25, 1975. After a discussion, the panel voted 3-2 for non-approval. Here are the minutes referring to that vote:

ACTION: Not approved for dissemination

The Panel did not approve this project for the following reasons: The basic objective of the project is stated to be one of "fostering growth in the affective area while not adversely affecting achievement." The data from the evaluation indicates, at best, only marginal gains in the affective area (experimental group gains ranged from only between 1 to 8% greater than the control group: see Table 7). The other source of affective data (Table 5) raises questions because of the substantial difference in the pre-test scores of the experimental and control groups. The evaluation attributes this difference to the fact that the experimental group was given the pre-test later than the control group, but this is only one of several possible explanations for the experimental group's significantly higher pre-test score. The data presented on the academic achievement measures would have to be clarified

7

before it would be possible to confidently conclude that there were either achievement gains or no achievement loss. In Table II, the kindergarten children (for whom there were significant differences) are inexplicably disaggregated from the remainder of the group (for whom there were not). The data in Table 24 do not present the pre-test differences even though the standardized test used was apparently administered on a pre-post basis. For these reasons, the Panel feel that neither the case for affective gains nor the case for achievement gains (or no achievement loss) was strong enough to recommend this project as one for Federal dissemination.

The Aftermath

As a consequence of the unfavorable decision, the Early Childhood Center began terminating its operation in August, 1975, after exhausting alternative sources of funding. State-administered Title III funds were no longer available, as support usually ends after three years. Section 306 funds went only to projects approved by the JDRP.

Local communities receiving direct services from the Center could no longer be counted upon for continued financial support. Among the reasons:

- * The Center had trained teachers and provided on-site consultation services to participating districts from two to five years. It had essentially achieved its purposes, thereby drastically reducing the need for its program.
- * Reduced local funds for consultation and inservice training. Faced with reductions in teaching staff, school committees were unwilling to finance the Center at levels they had supported earlier.
- * Participating communities were unwilling to pool their reduced inservice funds and purchase services from the Center.

The project staff attempted to expand the geographical area served by the Center through a vigorous regional dissemination program. Levels of involvement ranging in cost from \$10,000 a year for a full-service program to \$100 a day for individual consultation were offered to interested schools. Although initial response was strong, financial realities finally blunted this effort.

Formal affiliation with another project or agency was also explored as a means of continuing the project. Preliminary negotiations with a small number of agencies broke down and this effort was terminated.

Eventually, plans were made to transfer the Center's resource collection to a regional Special Education program so Massachusetts educators could continue to use it. The Project Director and the staff accepted positions in other school districts.

Project SHARE

Crookston, Minnesota

Crookston is a small, northern Minnesota town, the center of a farming region situated on the North Dakota border. Within the region, there are 22 independent school districts that range in size from 200 to 2,500 students (K-12). Altogether, about 14,000 public and 2,500 parochial students go to school in 65 separate buildings. Each district is governed by a board of directors and a superintendent.

The logistics of delivering special services to students in school districts with limited resources and separated by great distances pose a formidable administrative problem. Therefore, a state law was passed that required school districts unable to provide a full range of service to handicapped children to collaborate with neighboring districts.

Project Background

In response to this legislation, Crookston created the Regional Interdistrict Council in 1969 and charged it with the responsibility of designing and implementing a program to meet the special needs of students in participating districts. Nine superintendents were elected by participating school boards to serve as a board of directors. A director of special education, Marvin Hammerback, was hired. Supervisory and resource personnel were employed, and the Crookston Regional Interdistrict Council (RIC) became a legal entity.

Although foundation funding had supported the Council's planning efforts, it was decided to seek federal monies to provide instructional services for handicapped children. With approval of local school district administrators, a project development team composed of special educators submitted a ESEA Title II proposal to the Minnesota Department of Education for Project SHARE (Sharing High-Yield Accountability with Resource Educators). The project was approved by the Department in June, 1970.

Identifying students eligible to receive RIC services was one of the first tasks completed by Project SHARE. The criteria established were: (1) the student is one year or more below grade level, and (2) the student has an identifiable handicap -- perceptual, emotional, behavioral, intellectual, physical, or speech. Local Advisory Councils (LACs) were created to screen students referred for services. Once a student was accepted into the project, a criterion-based instructional program was developed. When the student reached pre-determined levels of performance, he or she would be considered ready to be mainstreamed back into the regular classroom.

Evaluation Begins

The task of coordinating services for handicapped children in 65 buildings required extensive data collection, documentation, and analysis to insure that the project was meeting its goals. The project design emphasized a systems approach that provided a high degree of accountability in terms of cost-effectiveness and the impact of the program on students. The evaluation component of the project was designed to collect hard data on the progress of individual students being treated and to compare that data with similar data collected for students who were not being treated. Precision teaching methods were used for diagnosis, prescription, monitoring, and evaluation of each student/client. The precision teaching system measured the accuracy and efficiency of each of the addressed skills in several learning modes, including visual, auditory, speech, and writing. Students were tested at each tutoring session, and were themselves involved in keeping track of their own progress by maintaining self-assessment charts.

First Year Results

During the project's first year, data was collected and manually tabulated; the outside evaluator collected subjective data and wrote case studies. Dr. Hammerback and the staff were dissatisfied with this approach, arguing that the hard data being collected was quite significant and would be more useful if it were computer processed. The Minnesota Department of Education agreed, and supported a transfer of the evaluation contract to a Kansas City firm, International Management Systems (formerly Behavior Research). A computer program was designed to monitor the progress of each child receiving services. Rather than drawing inferences from small samples, the new evaluation documented the whole project as well as provided tutors with ongoing feedback.

Evaluation results from the first three years on Project SHARE indicated that goals were being met. Dr. Hammerback's research orientation, the evaluation design itself, and the extensive data which had been produced regularly since the inception of the project solidified the results.

The IVD Process

In 1973, the Minnesota Department of Education Title III Director initiated the Identification, Validation, and Dissemination process. Dr. Hammerback and the project staff completed the forms required for submission to the IVD review team prior to an on-site visit. When the team arrived, however, it was learned that the information had not been presented correctly. Dr. Carl Koenig, Project Evaluator, met with the team at

length and provided the information they were lacking. The team itself offered substantial feedback to the project staff, a valuable means of formative evaluation, and provided a useful orientation to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel validation procedure.

As a result of successfully meeting the IVD review team standards, Project SHARE received an Educational Pacesetter Award from the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services in 1973.

Later that year, a presentation at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children by Project SHARE staff resulted in a number of inquiries from school districts around the country.

Title III Funding Expires

The end of fiscal year 1973 marked the end of three years of Title III funding for Project SHARE. Although financial responsibility for the project was a difficult burden for the local districts, the project was preserved. Among the changes necessitated by local funding was the replacement of the LACs by district committees to review district referrals. Because special education was a relatively low priority within the districts, it took substantial energy on the part of project staff to assure the continuation of sufficient funding.

JDRP Preparations Begin

Early in 1974, plans for submitting Project SHARE to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel began. The impetus for seeking JDRP approval was provided by the Minnesota Department of Education. Looking back, Dr. Hammerback sees two incentives behind the Minnesota Department of Education's pursuing JDRP approval: (1) validating the project after funding responsibilities had been assumed locally added a significant element of accountability; and (2) the project was extremely successful and seemed to have potential for meeting needs throughout the state as well as elsewhere in the country.

While willing to support this effort, Dr. Hammerback was not highly committed to the goal of achieving JDRP approval since the project had received IVD validation. Gregory Waddick, Director of the Division of Planning and Development of the Minnesota Title III office, and Leonard Nachman, an evaluator in that office, took responsibility for Project SHARE's application to the JDRP. They provided at-the-shoulder assistance in the preparation of materials and data. Simultaneously, a proposal was being prepared to submit Project SHARE to USOE for funding as a Developer-Demonstrator. The JDRP application was submitted in April, 1974, and it appeared on the April agenda.

First Submission to the JDRP

Project SHARE was presented to the JDRP by Donald Twiford, Chief, Western Program Operations Branch, Division of Supplementary Centers and Services, USOE. JDRP panel members raised a number of questions because information in the application was confusing or lacking altogether. Specifically, members questioned the cost-effectiveness data (information appeared to be missing), the comparison of student outcomes between those who had received tutoring and those who had not, and the absence of standardized test data to support these results. Dr. Twiford could not provide clarity on these issues. The JDRP voted overwhelmingly to disapprove Project SHARE's application, primarily on the weaknesses in the evaluation results.

In a debriefing among Project SHARE staff and others after this decision, it was determined that some information had not been presented clearly and persuasively in the application and other information, which the JDRP thought should have been in the application but was not, was indeed readily available. However, other concerns raised by the JDRP could only be addressed by gathering more complete data, especially data that demonstrated program effectiveness such as comparisons between students receiving treatment and those that did not.

In one area, Project SHARE's application to the JDRP contained too much information. Through a misreading of the JDRP's information requirements, the application included detailed plans -- prepared by the computer firm that performed data processing for SHARE -- on the utilization of computer programs in districts intending to adopt the SHARE program. This was extraneous information, as the JDRP looks for evidence that a program is capable of being installed in another location, but does not examine the plans for doing so. That is the province of the federal program officer, working in conjunction with the project director.

Despite the JDRP's disapproval of Project SHARE's application, the Division of Supplementary Centers and Services, USOE, entertained its proposal to become a Developer-Demonstrator under "Category B" funding. (See the reference in the Early Childhood Center case study, page 20.) Project SHARE received \$68,000 to continue its program and generate more data on its effectiveness.

Second Submission to the JDRP

The job of reworking the project data involved sorting through mountains of figures, writing new computer programs and synthesizing the results in a new form. The absence

of sufficient comparative data required establishing a control group and additional testing procedures. It was decided that introducing extensive use of standardized tests would encumber the project, so other means of verifying the student progress were sought. Grade level performance standards developed by the Special Education Cooperative in Bemidji, Wisconsin, were chosen.

Another area that needed attention was estimating the start-up costs for the project. Many complex factors made accurate estimates difficult. Costs for starting the project in Crookston included creating materials, gathering resources, developing training programs for tutors, etc. Since these costs would not be duplicated by adopters, it was difficult to separate the actual start-up costs from local costs.

On January 21, 1975, Project SHARE was presented to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel for the second time. Marshall Schmitt, USOE Title III Program Officer, represented the project. After discussing the material presented, the panel voted. There were five no votes and one yes vote. The following statement comes from the meeting's minutes:

"The Panel failed to approved (sic) this project primarily because of the apparent inconsistency between Table 1 and 2. Table 1 reports substantial grade-equivalent gains ranging from 1.2 to 1.4 in four curriculum areas, based on varied but sizeable Ns. However, the data in Table 2, apparently based on sub-samples of 69-104, report monthly grade equivalent gains which are either so small as to be of questionable value, or so large as to be both unbelievable and inconsistent with Table 1 (depending on how the decimal point is read in the grade-gain scores). The Panel recommended that the program staff try to clarify this question and, depending on the results of their inquiries, resubmit the project."

The second negative vote on Project SHARE was discouraging to Dr. Hammerback and the others who had invested substantial energy in preparing materials for re-submission. The task now was to review the project's raw data to discover any computational errors that may have been made in Tables 1 and 2. In addition, it seemed desirable to present the data differently so that the evaluation results would be clearer and conclusions could be more easily drawn. Len Nachman provided additional assistance and much needed encouragement. He and Dr. Schmitt also assured themselves that they understood exactly what the JDRP needed in order to be convinced that the project was succeeding.

Third and Final Submission

In the early months of 1975, the Project Summary was rewritten for a third submission. The project was scheduled for consideration at the JDRP's May 12th meeting. Dr. Schmitt arranged to have Dr. Hammerback and Carl Koenig, Project Evaluator, present

at the meeting to answer questions. Looking back on the experience, Dr. Hammerback felt that while some of the JDRP panel had reviewed the data at least superficially, others seemed not to have looked at it at all. The key factor convincing the Panel of the project's success, in Dr. Hammerback's opinion, was the grade gain results -- an average of 1.4 after 33 hours of tutoring with students who had been rapidly losing ground.

When the vote was taken, there were 6 'yes' votes and 2 'no' votes. The 'no' votes were not explained. At last, Project SHARE had JDRP approval.

Developer-Demonstrator Status

Meanwhile, in Spring 1975, the project's application for Developer-Demonstrator status was reviewed. Of the \$68,000 grant awarded in 1974, \$28,000 had been spent reconstructing the evaluation design and processing data. The remaining \$40,000 was carried forward, and an additional \$15,000 was granted to fund Project SHARE as a Developer-Demonstrator.

State Department Interface

Project SHARE was fortunate in having assistance from the Minnesota Department of Education continuously available. At this writing, the Project SHARE approach to providing special education services is utilized throughout Minnesota. In addition, the preparation of a User-Adopter Manual for the project has been funded by the Department. This document, in essence, provides a dissemination plan for the project.

In spite of the initial difficulties faced by Dr. Hammerback and his staff, there is reason to be optimistic about the availability of this proven approach to providing special education services. The existence of many potential demonstration sites within the state, the long and extensive involvement of Dr. Hammerback in the project, and the growing strength of the National Diffusion Network indicate that children throughout the country are benefitting from the pioneering work done in Crookston, Minnesota.

U-SAIL

Jordan, Utah

On April 29, 1975, the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) convened at the U.S. Office of Education to review four educational programs for evidence of effectiveness. Among the four was Project U-SAIL (Utah Systems Approach to Individualized Learning), based in Salt Lake City.

The JDRP approved the application of an early childhood education program from Oregon and rejected the other three. U-SAIL was disapproved unanimously, 9-0.

The vote against U-SAIL ran counter to the judgments of a considerable number of people representing several institutions who had also examined U-SAIL's record of educational effectiveness.

For example, the Utah Department of Public Instruction monitored U-SAIL, an ESEA Title III project, throughout its five-year existence. Its audit reports on U-SAIL were consistently favorable.

As a result of a program review by an on-site evaluation team, the ESEA Title III National Advisory Council issued U-SAIL a Pacesetter award in 1973. These awards were given only to those projects whose programs met the highest standards of excellence.

A four-person team spent three days conducting an on-site evaluation of U-SAIL using the Identification, Validation, and Dissemination (IVD) process designed and implemented by the U.S. Office of Education. This team, all of whom were professional educators from out-of-state, gave the project a 100% rating. In its reports, the team summarized its findings:

From the standpoint of exportability, U-SAIL has successfully developed and implemented an effective set of practices for individualizing instruction. Many projects and schools that profess to have individualized programs cannot withstand the test of validation. Many other efforts to develop individualized practices have failed miserably. U-SAIL's keys to success can be found in the application of systems theory to the development and installation of the project and in the competence and dedication of the project staff.

Finally, local educators rendered a judgment on U-SAIL by accepting its program. In Utah, the eight school districts in which U-SAIL was pilot-tested contributed funds and services amounting to 70% of U-SAIL's budget for FY 1975 -- a highly practical vote of confidence.

This pattern of acceptance extended beyond Utah. After visiting the U-SAIL project and evaluating the results being obtained in Utah schools, educators from a consortium of eight Arizona districts chose the U-SAIL program as the central focus for their ACIL (Arizona Consortium for Individualized Learning). And by 1975, five years after the U-SAIL began, its program had been diffused to schools in nineteen states.

Why, then, the difference of opinion between members of the JDRP, who cast a unanimous vote against the U-SAIL application, and people in the field, evaluators and educators alike, who examined the U-SAIL program firsthand? Could U-SAIL have presented its case to JDRP more clearly? Was it worth the effort to submit a revised application?

Indeed, it was. In October, 1976, some eighteen months after the first, disappointing vote, U-SAIL was approved by the JDRP -- unanimously. So was Project ACIL, whose program was adapted from U-SAIL. A review of the U-SAIL experience should add some insight into the process of review by the JDRP and the consequences of its decisions.

Project Background

The U-SAIL project evolved from an earlier Title III project in Utah -- the Continuous Progress Education Project (CPE), whose goal was to develop a model for individualizing instruction. In 1970, the U.S. Office of Education recognized CPE's contribution to education by including four CPE schools in a list of 48 outstanding, innovative schools in the U.S. CPE's project director also received a Pacesetter award from the ESEA Title III National Advisory Council. The results of the project were published in Individualized Instruction: A Manual for Administrators, DCE Publications, 1970.

Despite national recognition for CPE's pioneering efforts towards individualizing instruction, there was still considerable work to be done. A systematic method for individualizing instruction needed development, a method that could also be easily adopted by other schools. Curriculum materials to support a changeover to individualized instruction were also in great demand. In view of these goals, CPE's policy board, its advisory committee, and the project staff determined that another, more comprehensive project should be started. It would be designed to produce a practical system for individualizing instruction from grades K-12. A proposal for this purpose was submitted to the Utah Department of Public Instruction.

With the award of an ESEA Title III grant, the U-SAIL project got underway. Carma Hales was selected to be the project director. A former teacher, supervisor, administrator, and writer, she had several years experience working with and directing federal programs. She has a Ph.D. in Administration with a minor in Curriculum and Supervision.

The local educational agency that receives and disburses funds for U-SAIL is the Jordan School District. However, the project serves a consortium of eight school districts in Utah, and their superintendents of schools, along with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, constitute U-SAIL's Policy Board. The Board meets regularly and has full policy-making authority, like that of a school board.

U-SAIL's original staff was comprised of former CPE staff members, plus several others hired outright. After five years, six of the thirteen professional staff still remained in the project, giving it an unusual degree of continuity. Other staff members have been assigned to U-SAIL on a temporary basis by the eight school districts in the consortium. They work for U-SAIL for a year or two, and then return to their school systems, frequently to assume a supervisory position in which they can carry on U-SAIL's programs. All staff have at least a Master's degree or its equivalent in Supervision and Curriculum, and teaching experience in elementary, secondary or university settings.

U-SAIL's Program

The U-SAIL program is designed to provide an individualized education system that is tailored to a school district's resources and limitations. Such a system includes in-service programs for teachers and administrators, diagnostic and prescriptive curricular materials for placing students at appropriate levels, and a process for installing the system that enlists the support of faculty and staff.

U-SAIL has developed inexpensive, readily usable curriculum materials in language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, early childhood education, and Spanish -- all of which have been placed on the state adoption list by the Utah State Textbook Commission.

It is not necessary, however, for a school adopting the U-SAIL program to use the U-SAIL curriculum materials. The program is sufficiently flexible, because it concentrates on a system rather than specific products, for a school to implement individualized instruction with curriculum materials on hand or in combination with U-SAIL programs.

Several U-SAIL curriculum programs have been commended by independent evaluators. For example, in 1974, Capla Associates, an educational consulting firm in New Jersey, cited the U-SAIL mathematics programs as one of thirteen exemplary programs in the country in a study sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. Again, a year later, the same firm included the U-SAIL mathematics programs on a list of ten outstanding math programs in another study.

It requires from six months to two years, depending on past experience, expertise, resources available, and degree of commitment to install a U-SAIL reading or mathematics program. The average time is about one year. In-service training for teachers includes twelve hours before school begins in the fall, followed by eighteen hours in three to four hour blocks throughout the year so teachers have an opportunity for clarification, reinforcement, reteaching, and the introduction of new concepts.

Administrative leadership is essential for installing the U-SAIL program. Typically, a school superintendent interested in U-SAIL either visits the Salt Lake Center for a briefing on the program, or arranges for one or more U-SAIL staff to visit his school district. Principals and supervisors receive twenty-four hours of training and then participate in the in-service training program for teachers. U-SAIL staff also provides technical assistance at the school and classroom level during installation.

The U-SAIL program is typically installed one content area at a time. As teachers develop expertise, other areas are added until the entire system of individualized instruction occurs. The extent to which implementation has occurred is important for measuring the impact of the U-SAIL program on student affective outcomes. Such analysis was included in U-SAIL's second submission to the JDRP.

The U-SAIL program for grades K-6 has been widely accepted. By the end of the 1975-76 school year, it was incorporated, in whole or in part, in 305 schools in 38 states. In Arizona alone, some 62 schools in 20 districts have adopted U-SAIL as the model for the Arizona Consortium for Individualized Learning (ACIL). In New Jersey, Georgia, Idaho, Oregon, and in other Arizona schools, SAIL projects are direct replications of the U-SAIL project. U-SAIL curriculum materials are also utilized in schools in Europe, Canada, Puerto Rico, and the Phillipines.

U-SAIL is continuing to refine and disseminate its elementary program, and is currently focusing on the development of the secondary level program.

Program Evaluation

Evaluation has been an integral part of U-SAIL throughout its existence. The project has emphasized formative evaluation -- measuring the effectiveness of products or techniques as they were developed -- and summative evaluation -- measuring the impact of the overall program on a classroom, school, or school district. Generally, staff evaluators and independent evaluators sought answers to broad questions: "Is the U-SAIL model sound? Is it exportable? Will it be accepted? Is it effective?" However,

evaluation procedures were also designed that could fine tune an implementation program. For example, if data showed that extensive individualization had occurred in a school, but students had not registered gains in the affective domain as expected, then adjustments in program implementation could be made to achieve that result.

To assist in program development, U-SAIL organized a longitudinal testing program. Students in eight experimental schools were randomly selected and compared to students in eight control schools. The schools were matched according to location, socio-economic level, ethnic composition, and student mobility. Unfortunately, the school population shifted so dramatically within three years that the testing program had to be abandoned. However, data continued to be collected and analyzed on students in the experimental schools.

U-SAIL utilized several instruments to measure attitudes and environments. A student attitude and activity survey was designed and tested for validity and reliability. An Individualized Environment Survey for teacher, students, and administrators was created. The evaluators and staff also employed semantic differentials, the Tennessee Self-Concept Instrument, the Piers-Harris Test, and various staff-developed procedures.

Throughout the project, U-SAIL worked closely with the Utah Department of Public Instruction on evaluation issues. The state educational agency conducted annual audits of U-SAIL, provided ongoing consultant services on evaluation and program development, and assigned independent teams of evaluators to review the project on site.

Validating the U-SAIL Project

The Utah Department of Public Instruction decided to support the Identification, Validation, and Dissemination process advocated by the U.S. Office of Education. This was a state level effort to identify exemplary projects whose programs could be adopted by schools with reasonable assurance that they would be effective. ESEA Title III projects in Utah were encouraged to undergo the on-site evaluation required by the IVD program, and U-SAIL subsequently indicated its willingness to participate.

In March, 1973, nearly three years after U-SAIL started, a team of four evaluators conducted an on-site evaluation. Their comprehensive, 87-page report gave U-SAIL the highest rating allowable on each of the four criteria: innovativeness, cost-effectiveness, educational effectiveness, and exportability. The team unanimously recommended that U-SAIL be validated.

Despite this conclusion, their report hinted at shortcomings in U-SAIL's evaluation program:

At this point in time, no written formal evaluation design exists for the U-SAIL project. The Project has been operating with an "assumed evaluation design" which is well understood by the appropriate Project personnel. Evaluation in the Project has been carried out according to this "assumed evaluation design." It is recommended that the Project staff develop a written evaluation design including all components of the Project.

At this point in time, collection of data on student performance (both cognitive and affective) has not been extensive. There are plans for collecting adequate data on the performance of students. This data should be collected, documented, and analyzed by June, 1973.

The majority of data analysis at this point has been done on the descriptive level. No inferential techniques have been used to analyze data collected in the Project at this point in time. In the future, statistical comparison should be made utilizing both pre- and post-test data for experimental and control groups from an inferential point of view.

Because the U-SAIL program was under development for more than three years, and because the objective was to develop a model that other schools could follow to individualize instruction, the project emphasized process or formative evaluation rather than inferential analysis of student outcomes. The IVD team did not, according to U-SAIL staff, directly fault the evaluation approach taken by U-SAIL. Evaluation was an integral part of the project. Data had been consistently collected. An effective program of individualized instruction had been produced with considerable reliance upon process evaluation, along with a strategy for installing the program in schools. However, the team recommended that data be collected and analyzed on student achievement as U-SAIL moved towards the dissemination of its program.

Submitting an Application to the JDRP

U-SAIL staff members heard about the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) for the first time from colleagues at regional education conferences in Utah, who asked if U-SAIL had been approved by the JDRP and if it had received any federal funds to diffuse its program nationally. Soon thereafter, a number of school administrators informed U-SAIL staff of their perception that national validation would further enhance the program's appeal to potential replicators.

Dr. Hales called the Utah Department of Public Instruction for information about submitting an application for validation to the JDRP. She was referred to Tom Wikstrom, Title III Program Officer, who, assuming that Dr. Hales' inquiry stemmed from an awareness of the benefits of achieving JDRP validation, described the process and sent guidelines for preparing an application for JDRP review. However, although U-SAIL was

already deeply involved in diffusing its program nationally, the staff did not learn that JDRP approval could lead to Developer-Demonstrator status and a federal grant to support diffusion activities until they had begun preparing their submission.

In seeking support from Utah educators to apply for JDRP approval, U-SAIL staff found little enthusiasm but no active opposition. The state Title III coordinator pointed out that U-SAIL's primary mission -- developing its K-12 program and disseminating it within Utah -- would not be enhanced by a favorable JDRP vote. U-SAIL staff did not check with the State Facilitator project in Utah, although its funds flowed through the same local education agency as did U-SAIL's. The Policy Board for U-SAIL did not prohibit the staff from applying, but the members considered this activity to be much lower in priority than other activities having a direct effect on the Utah educational system.

Preparing the Application

Because data was difficult to obtain, and little time could be devoted to the task, a U-SAIL staff member hurriedly prepared a draft for submittal. The 18-page application (eight pages longer than suggested) presented student data in cognitive and non-cognitive areas for U-SAIL's developmental period (1970-73) and its developmental/operational period (1974). In addition, it listed the favorable evaluations given U-SAIL, quoting at length from the 1973 IVD report on U-SAIL.

Most of the data in the application was explained in terms of "positive trends," "substantial gains," "consistent differences favoring experimental students," "substantial growth." After three years of testing, U-SAIL's strongest statement was ". . . analysis of achievement test results revealed that U-SAIL experimental students continued to perform as well as or better on the Stanford than the controls at most grade levels."

One table indicated a correlation coefficient between the extent of U-SAIL program implementation and positive growth in student self-concept and other non-cognitive measures which was significant to .05. Except for one other table, the application did not claim any other statistically significant achievement gains or experimental-control differences.

For the 1973-74 school year, the application stated that scores from district testing programs showed a higher gain for U-SAIL students over a one to two year period than students in control schools when compared to the district mean score. This was seen as strong evidence of favorable spin-off by the third year.

The Decision of the JDRP -- First Review

The minutes for the meeting of April 29, 1975, list the following reasons for disapproving the application from U-SAIL:

- A. Ambiguity and questions exist concerning comparability of treatment and control schools. At one point, the submission discusses random samples but at another talks about a matching procedure.
- B. In some cases there is no control group.
- C. Data presented are incomplete. There is no data on total instances involved, and the data reported is selected from high implementation groups.
- D. Differences between the treatment group and the control group are marginal or questionably small for recommendation.
- E. The math results in Table 8 have no basis for comparison.

The Reaction

U-SAIL staff learned of the 9-0 vote for non-approval from Dr. Wikstrom. Since it was not yet common practice for project representatives to attend their review, no one from U-SAIL was present at the JDRP meeting to respond to questions about the program. However, the meeting minutes provided helpful feedback on the shortcomings of their hastily prepared write-up.

In reviewing the result, the U-SAIL staff acknowledged that their submission had been "hurriedly done," and contained too much data on too many student populations without consideration of the extent to which the U-SAIL program had been installed or the availability of controls.

Submitting the Second Application; Comparisons with the First Application

More than a year after its first application was rejected unanimously, U-SAIL re-applied for JDRP validation. It was obvious the project had learned from the experience. The second application was a very tightly constructed document that anticipated the kinds of questions members of the JDRP would likely ask. The JDRP approved the second application without a dissenting vote, and with no commentary recorded in the minutes, indicating that the application was overwhelmingly persuasive. How the two applications differ on a number of key points -- goals and objectives, description of project, cost of implementation, and, most importantly, evidence of effectiveness -- will indicate, to some degree, what the JDRP considers convincing evidence and what it does not.

Goals and Objectives

The first application contains a "goals and objectives" statement that is accurate, but much too general. It does not serve as a peg on which to hang the rest of the argument.

First Application

Goals and Objectives

The purpose of the project is to develop an open individualized instructional system on a kindergarten through twelfth year basis to be accomplished in integrated stages beginning with the lower grades. Included in the effort is implementation of the system through staff development programs for administrators and teachers. Also included has been supportive curriculum products development.

In the second application, notice the narrowing of the overall objective -- a reading and math program for grades 1-6, rather than an individualized instructional system for K-12. And the language is much tighter. In essence, the authors of the second application limited their goals and objectives statement to what they could prove.

Second Application

Major Goal: To develop an effective, cost-feasible, exportable, open-system model for individualization of instruction, 1-6, in reading and mathematics.

Objective: Where the system is installed, students will make significantly higher academic achievement gains in reading and mathematics, as measured by the scores on standardized achievement tests, than students in comparison groups. In addition, the students in the system will show significantly positive relationships between degree and time of implementation and attitudes as measured by the Student Attitude and Activity Survey (SAAS) and Individualized Environment Observation Form (IEO) affective measures.

Description of the Project

In this section, the number of words devoted to describing U-SAIL was the difference between the two applications. In the first, the description did not exceed 300 words -- too perfunctory a treatment of a program as comprehensive as U-SAIL's. U-SAIL actually encompasses a theory of individualizing instruction, a strategy of implementation, and the effective use of curriculum materials, either U-SAIL's or those of another producer. From a 1200 word description in the second application, which included sections on curricula, implementation strategy, parental involvement, inservice training, materials, staff, facilities, time involved for installation, and cost of installation, JDRP members could visualize the overall program.

Cost of Implementation

Again, the second application is more precise, more informative:

First Application

Total costs per pupil for implementing program for supportive curriculum materials varies according to curriculum area. For example, math materials are \$8.00; reading, \$4.00; writing through spelling, \$6.50. Schools may implement the U-SAIL program with any or all of the materials depending on their individual school situation.

Second Application

Cost of Implementation:

Average Cost: Curriculum products, \$8.00 per student per content area. (Approximately \$7.00 in a 600 plus student school.)

Staff Training: Inservice and technical assistance, \$12.00 per student per year. (Approximately \$6.00 per student in a 600 plus student school.) In a content adoption year, the curriculum product costs could be absorbed by a regular district textbook budget.

Evidence of Effectiveness: Cognitive Achievement

The heart of the application is the section entitled "Evidence of Effectiveness." It is here that a project must prove its claims of program effectiveness. In both applications, U-SAIL presented evidence of effectiveness on cognitive and affective measures.

For cognitive achievement, U-SAIL not only selected other evidence for its second application than that presented in the first, but also changed the organization of this evidence. The first application divided the presentation of evidence into two time periods: a developmental period (1970-73) and an operational/developmental period (1973-74). In most instances, the evidence covered a one-year span (evaluation during the first two years of the developmental period was largely formative). Thus, the JDRP reviewed a document that presented evidence based on two years of testing, each year described separately.

In contrast, the second application described cognitive achievement in terms of "replication sites" rather than time periods. A replication site, in this context, meant a site at which the U-SAIL program was implemented, including the pilot site. Three sites were located in Utah, one in Arizona, and one in Georgia. Thus, U-SAIL presented evidence collected over a two-year period in three replication sites, over a one-year period in another, and over a six-month period in the last. Evidence thus collected over time and from several settings strengthens the claims of stability and generalizability of the program's impact.

The other, glaring difference between the two applications was in the nature of the claim made. The first application spoke of "positive trends," "program implementation differences favoring U-SAIL students," "substantial growth in terms of mathematics concepts measured." The second application presented statistically significant data, including tables, on all five replication sites as evidence of program effectiveness in reading and mathematics. "Results show that U-SAIL students significantly outperform control students in reading and mathematics," the second report concluded. "The strength of these results lies in the fact that results were uniformly and significantly in favor of U-SAIL students across five independent replication samples.

To compare how well the two applications presented cognitive results, here are two excerpts, one from each application. They will be compared in terms of certain key questions, so that the preciseness of language and the kind of supporting information presented becomes readily apparent. (Although a Table 3 is mentioned in each excerpt, the data describe two separate testing events, one in pilot schools in Salt Lake City and environs, an entry in Application #1, and the other in a school in southern Utah, Application #2.)

What students were tested, and who did the testing?

First Application

During the 1973-74 school year, data were collected on multiple measures for a sample of students in U-SAIL schools that had completed at least one year as participants in the U-SAIL project. Achievement test data were collected on the schools from the regular district testing programs. The testing procedures were conducted by the districts. Each district maintained its own testing program independent of other districts.

Second Application

A third replication of the U-SAIL system was implemented in a rural setting in southern Utah on one sample of students in Sevier School District. The testing was conducted by the school district evaluation specialist and the data were analyzed by the U-SAIL project evaluation specialist and the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Utah.

Tests were administered to both U-SAIL and control fourth grade students in March, 1974, and the post-test was administered in March, 1976, to the same population when they were in the sixth grade, providing a two-year intervention period.

What testing instruments were used?

First Application

(A table accompanying this section indicates in its heading that SRA and ITBS were used. There is no reference to the instruments in the text -- editor's note.)

Second Application

The instrument used was the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-Form A), mathematics and reading total scores. The same test was used for both pre- and post-testing.

How were the experimental and control groups chosen?

First Application

Matching procedures for selection of control schools within the districts are based on the following criteria: location, socio-economic level, ethnic composition, mobility, control over program used, and availability of data.

Second Application

Experimental and control populations included all students at the third grade level who remained in the school for the two years tested. Matching of experimental and control schools was based on socio-economic level, mobility, ethnic background, and IQ scores (data available from district reports and Utah Industrial Development Information System census reports).

What information is displayed in the table accompanying the text?

First Application

Text: Table 3 presents the results for each experimental school where gain scores are available.

Title of Table 3:

Achievement Test Results

Mean gain scores for U-SAIL schools as compared with control schools and local district gain.

Second Application

Text: Table 3 shows the pre- and post-test means, standard deviations, range, N's, mean gain, and difference in mean gains for U-SAIL and control students on reading and mathematics total scores. Scores are expressed as grade equivalents, but raw scores were used for the analysis. A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted for reading and mathematics total scores.

Title of Table 3:

Reading and Math achievement test results for U-SAIL experimental and control groups, replication 3. Gain score comparisons for two-year period. Pre-test, fourth grade, March, 1974. Post-test, sixth grade, March, 1976.

What conclusions can be drawn from the evidence presented?

First Application

Achievement test results on U-SAIL schools where gain scores are available show positive trends in favor of U-SAIL schools. The results indicate that the gain over a one or two-year period for the students tested is higher for U-SAIL schools as compared with control schools or district mean gain.

In U-SAIL schools with a high degree of U-SAIL program installation, substantial gains in achievement have been measured as compared with their control schools. The most substantial gains are in schools that measure highest in degree of U-SAIL program installation.

Second Application

Table 3 shows that the mean gain in reading for experimental students over the two-year period was 2.7 grade equivalents as compared with 2.1 for controls with a mean gain difference of .6 grade equivalents (significant at the .02 level). In math, the experimental mean gain for two years was 3.2 grade equivalents as compared with 2.0 for controls representing a mean gain difference of 1.2 grade equivalents (significant at the .001 level).

The second application included a format for discussing evidence of effectiveness for all five replication sites. It is offered as a suggested guide to presenting effectiveness information from several settings:

- * location of testing,
- * title of person(s) or organization(s) conducting and/or analyzing test results,
- * description of students tested (grade level, years in program, etc.),
- * selection of experimental and control students (random selection, matching, basis for matching),
- * test instruments used,
- * dates of testing,
- * discussion of data displayed in table,
- * presentation of data in table accompanying the text,
- * interpretation of the data in the table, and conclusions.

Evidence of Effectiveness: Affective Outcomes

Affect was measured by a U-SAIL-constructed test called the Student Attitude and Activity Survey (SAAS). It measured student attitude towards school, towards mathematics and several other subjects, participation in activities relating to individualized instruction, and self-concept. A second instrument -- the Individualized Environment Observation Form (IEO) measured the extent to which the U-SAIL program had been implemented in a classroom. It relied upon the notations of an external observer.

These tests indicated how affective characteristics were influenced by the U-SAIL program and whether the degree to which the U-SAIL program had been implemented made any difference on the outcomes.

It was in this section that the first application claimed statistically significant results on the basis of testing in seven schools:

Table 4 demonstrates a strong positive relationship between the implementation of U-SAIL program and student attitude toward self and school. All relationships were significant. The most substantial significance was demonstrated in the relationship between U-SAIL program implementation and reinforcement of self-concept, attitude toward mathematics, total school subject reaction and student process activities relating to independence and responsibility.

The second application made a similar claim on the basis of testing in fifteen Utah elementary schools, also using the SAAS and the IEO as the testing instruments. However, the second application took some space to explain the validity and reliability of these two locally-constructed instruments, whereas the first application dealt with this in a footnote.

The first application said:

Construction of the Student Attitude and Activity Survey consisted of various refinement procedures including determination of construct validity of scales and reliability estimates.

In contrast, the second application devoted 250 words to "instrumentation." The section is too long to repeat here, but this excerpt gives the flavor of the presentation:

Construct validity, content validity, and reliability both on an internal consistency and test/retest basis have been demonstrated. Examples of concurrent validity for the SAAS were $r = .48$ for self-concept scale with the Piers-Harris self-concept instrument and $r = .73$ for the SAAS attitude-toward-school scale with the HERSC attitude-toward-school instrument (developed by Utah State Board of Education)....

After this introduction on "instrumentation," the second application set forth the evidence on affective impact. It concluded:

Where the U-SAIL system was installed in fifteen Utah elementary schools, students showed positive significant relationships between degree and time of implementation and attitudes as measured by the (SAAS) and (IEO) affective measures. Statistical significance was beyond the .01 level.

The Use of Testimonials

It is tempting, when statistical evidence is sketchy at best or lacking altogether, to fall back on testimonials. There were two types of testimonials in the first application; none in the second.

The first emphasized the extent to which the U-SAIL program had been adopted by other schools, implying that U-SAIL would not have been so widely accepted if it were not a good program. This is an example of this type of testimonial as it appeared in the first application:

At this time, 51 schools in 19 districts, representing over 21,500 students and 850 teachers, are involved in the U-SAIL project.

Outside of Utah, the project has expanded into other states including 46 schools in Arizona representing 26,000 students and 900 teachers. Schools in Idaho, Georgia, and other states and the military schools in Europe are also involved with the U-SAIL program.

Only indirectly did the second application make the point about other schools adopting the U-SAIL program. It submitted data on Project PEGASUS in Georgia and the Arizona Consortium for Individualized Learning (ACIL) -- both projects a replication of U-SAIL programs. Data on these two replications indicated that not only did U-SAIL work in other locations, but also that educators in different parts of the country had examined the U-SAIL program and thought it good enough to install in their schools. (Ironically,

Project PEGASUS had been approved by the JDRP before U-SAIL submitted its first application. ACIL's application received a unanimous vote for validation at the same meeting as did U-SAIL.)

The first application carried these testimonials as evidence that evaluators, many of whom came to the project and reviewed the data firsthand, had declared U-SAIL programs to be effective. An adverse decision by the JDRP would fly in the face of these judgments. It made no difference. The JDRP was looking for direct evidence. It did not find enough in the first application, and so turned it down.

U-SAIL's second application concentrated on presenting direct evidence for its claims of effectiveness. And this evidence supported, to the satisfaction of the JDRP, the following conclusion:

The U-SAIL Project has developed an effective, cost-feasible, exportable system for individualization of instruction. Data analysis reviewed in this report indicate that in a pilot setting, and in replication efforts, there is a positive statistically significant relationship between U-SAIL system implementation and student cognitive and affective growth.

Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching Program

Fargo, North Dakota

The Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching Program for Disadvantaged Children with Learning Disabilities was developed in Fargo, North Dakota, a city of 55,000 located in the Red River Valley. Its public school system enrolls 10,300 students, of which 6,600 are elementary students. The project's target area consists of six public elementary and two parochial schools. All were designated as model cities area schools and are eligible for Title I funding.

Project Background

Fargo used a portion of their Title I monies to support early childhood education. When it appeared questionable that Title I funding would continue for this purpose, the superintendent of schools and the assistant superintendent for curriculum sought Title III funds to continue support for the Pre-Kindergarten Program. They anticipated that with funding from one or the other source, the early childhood population in the model cities area would not lose services. Fargo was fortunate to receive funding from both titles, so that the program was not only able to continue, but extend its services.

Director Hired

Robert Hunton was named director of the Pre-Kindergarten Program in 1972. A school psychologist with a background in research and statistics, Dr. Hunton had several years experience in working with school staff, parents, and children with learning disabilities. He was also familiar with the problems of early childhood education. As a result, he felt that, typically, programs in early childhood education have failed to demonstrate cognitive gains in children. In contrast, this program's conceptual framework and evaluation design included carefully established cognitive goals and an evaluation plan based on a comparison between treatment and control groups on a pre- and post-test basis.

Student Diagnosis and Project Objectives

The Pre-Kindergarten Program was designed to help children who were weak in specific learning areas but who were not retarded. The emerging field of learning disabilities encompasses conflicting schools of thought concerning their diagnosis and treatment. The resulting controversy affects every aspect of an intervention, and begins with the definition of learning disabilities itself. The program's screening techniques for identifying these children differed from traditional approaches. All four-year-old children in the target area were screened through a criterion-referenced test, and depending on their score, a standardized test as well. Those scoring lowest on a

composite score of these were admitted to the program. Further criterion-referenced assessment and ongoing diagnostic testing of the pupils provides the basis for individualized and group instruction.

Experience had shown the project developers and Dr. Hunton that by age four, a disability in one learning area tends to affect performance in other areas. For example, if a child has a perceptual problem, he is likely to demonstrate low achievement in cognitive tasks. Consequently, testing will indicate that his general intelligence is low. One disadvantage of this procedure was that an extremely bright child with a learning disability who had learned to compensate for it might very well slip through and receive no help.

The staff of the Pre-Kindergarten Program also decided to ignore the original federal definition of learning disabilities which did not include handicaps due to cultural or socio-economic factors. The developers of the program believed that this omission was arbitrary and artificial since a disability derived from cultural or socio-economic factors was functionally the same as those recognized by the federal definition.

When Dr. Hunton assumed the directorship, he carefully reviewed the objectives of the project and concluded that while the objectives were desirable and laudable, they were probably unrealistically high and incapable of being attained during the period of federal funding.

Community Involvement

Despite Dr. Hunton's prediction, the results of the first year demonstrated that the project had not only met its objectives, but exceeded them. Despite this success, however, Dr. Hunton was having difficulty retaining the full support of the central administration.

At the time he took over as director, the persons in the central administration who sponsored the Pre-Kindergarten Program, the superintendent of schools and the assistant superintendent for curriculum, resigned from the Fargo Public schools to assume positions elsewhere. Their successors had little personal investment in the Pre-Kindergarten Program, and considered other problems more deserving of funds than a program for children whose age put them outside the formal responsibility of the public school system. (In North Dakota, the state does not reimburse school systems for kindergarten or pre-kindergarten programs.)

Although the Pre-Kindergarten Program was federally-funded, the central administration and the Fargo school board would eventually be faced with the decision of whether to assume the cost of the program when that funding ceased. Dr. Hunton felt, therefore, that it was in the best interests of the program to muster strong community support.

The proposal for the Pre-Kindergarten Program called for a community advisory council, composed of parents, community leaders, and members of the school system, to be established. The council would meet monthly to review the activities of the program with the project staff. Another community outreach effort provided seminars for parents designed to provide them with information about learning disabilities and program services. Also, the staff scheduled conferences with parents to discuss their own child's situation.

Despite these plans, the project had difficulty generating parental or community support. Typically, community involvement in activities of this type had been low in Fargo, and public support difficult to obtain. Dr. Hunton's task was complicated by the fact that the local media did not draw attention to programs for the low income section of the city, where the pre-kindergarten program was located. Further, this section traditionally had little influence on city affairs.

The IVD Process

Dr. Hunton began investigating ways of gaining recognition and support for the Pre-Kindergarten Program in hopes of influencing a school board decision to absorb program costs once federal funding terminated. Identification, Validation, and Dissemination (IVD), a validation process sponsored by the ESEA Title III program in the U.S. Office of Education, offered an opportunity to obtain an independent judgment on the merits of the project.

To respond to the IVD process' requirement for an on-site review of the project by a team of evaluators, the North Dakota Title III office invited four educators to participate: a member of the Title III staff from the Minnesota Department of Education, the Director of the Computer Center at the University of South Dakota at Aberdeen, and the assistant superintendent of finance at Ames, Iowa. A fifth member came from the staff of the North Dakota Title III office.

To prepare for the evaluation, Dr. Hunton and his staff compiled extensive information on the program and on the IVD criteria: its success with pre-kindergarten children, its cost-effectiveness, and its exportability to other school districts.

Since the IVD process requires an on-site visit, team members were able to probe deeply into the record of the project and generally sought clarity on issues that data or other information did not conclusively address. For example, a weakness noted by the team was insufficient data supporting the claim that the project was cost-effective. Before the team left Fargo, Dr. Hunton supplied additional information that satisfied the team on this point. This on-site interaction provides a project director with a very helpful formative evaluation.

After reviewing the Pre-Kindergarten Program, the IVD team concluded that it warranted validation as a program that could be adopted by other schools with a reasonable expectation that results similar to those obtained in Fargo could be repeated in another school district. The team also suggested that the program be utilized at the kindergarten level, thus making it more attractive to school systems that did not run pre-kindergarten programs.

With a favorable report from the IVD team and the attainment of an Educational Pacesetter Award (given by the Title III National Advisory Council to exemplary projects), the Pre-Kindergarten Program made substantial progress towards gaining public recognition and support. The staff was particularly gratified to be confirmed in their belief that their approach to identifying and treating learning disabled children -- an approach surrounded by some controversy -- had merit and a potential for widespread applicability.

Submitting an Application to the JDRP

Dr. Hunton became interested in seeking approval from the JDRP through the suggestion of David Lee, a staff member from the North Dakota Title III office who served on the IVD team that reviewed the Pre-Kindergarten Program. Dr. Lee, a new person on the staff of the Title III office, believed in taking an active role in promoting worthy projects. Dr. Hunton welcomed his initiative, since there had been limited support from the state Title III office before Dr. Lee's involvement.

Dr. Hunton prepared the application to the JDRP with a good deal at stake. The Pre-Kindergarten Program was nearing the end of its three-year period of federal funding. Although negotiations had been initiated with the central office for continuing the program with local funds, the preliminary discussions had not been encouraging. Thus, approval by the JDRP was very important because it could eventually result in additional federal funds to diffuse the program nationwide. Despite this opportunity,

the Fargo administration did not encourage the submission of an application to the JDRP, but neither did they deny it. The only expression of encouragement came from the Director of Special Education in the school district.

Completing the JDRP application required a substantial investment of time, a frustrating process for the staff since they had engaged in a similar effort for the IVD review. (The parallel processes both require the presentation of student impact data, but in somewhat different formats.)

Dr. Lee sought advice on preparing the project submission from Marshall Schmitt, the USOE Title III Program Officer who was sponsoring the application. Dr. Schmitt offered to go to Fargo to help develop the document, but Dr. Hunton declined, feeling that his training in research and statistics enabled him to prepare a sound document. In addition, he was assisted by the project evaluator, who also held a doctorate in research and statistics.

The research orientation of the evaluation design and the outcomes of the evaluation made their task easier. The pre- and post-tests of both treatment and control groups produced data that was convincing beyond question. The project had achieved, indeed surpassed, its goals.

The Pre-Kindergarten Program was one of four projects to be presented to the JDRP on February 25, 1975. Two projects were disapproved, and one was approved by a vote of 5-1. The Pre-Kindergarten Program was the only project to receive a unanimous vote of approval.

Attaining Developer-Demonstrator Status

In April, 1975, with this approval behind them, the program's application for Developer-Demonstrator status under the National Diffusion Network was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education. A month later, the Pre-Kindergarten Program was granted diffusion funds.

Aftermath

The strategy of seeking approval from state and national evaluators began to pay off on the local scene, as Dr. Hunton had hoped. The school system committed local funding to support the program, a decision considerably influenced by Dr. Lee. He talked with the superintendent of schools and sought his support to continue the program, citing its evidence that early identification of a disability leads to a more successful, cost-effective remediation approach.

However, the school system could not continue the program at the same level of funding as was possible with federal monies. This forced a sizeable cutback in the number of children to be served in the school district, since the diffusion grant was to be used for exporting the program to other school districts.

Without the approval of the IVD team and the JDRP, which led to the designation of Developer-Demonstrator project and more federal funds, Dr. Hunton believes that the Fargo school board would have abandoned the project altogether. While continuing to operate as a demonstration center, the Pre-Kindergarten Program has begun to have impact on children elsewhere in the country. During 1976, several school districts in North Dakota and Minnesota have used segments of the program, and it has been adopted in its entirety by eight school districts in Rhode Island.

**Submitting an Application
to the JDRP:
Thoughts and Observations**

One should not draw conclusions about the JDRP -- its process, the effect of its decisions on projects -- from the experience of the four projects described here. The JDRP has existed for more than four years. It has met some 70 times, reviewed about 300 submissions, and validated the effectiveness claims of about 60% of them. How these projects fared after JDRP review and any generalizations about the JDRP process await a more comprehensive survey.

However, we do offer certain observations about the process that may prove useful to project directors who want to present their best case to the JDRP. We do this for the purpose of focusing attention on the importance of good evaluation design, and the necessity for generating reliable data from the beginning of a project.

1. A review of the evidence that projects have submitted to the JDRP, and the JDRP's reaction to this evidence, indicates that projects which have been approved by the JDRP generally:

- * base their case for effectiveness on student outcome data that is generated by traditional research designs.
- * use standardized, norm-referenced instruments to generate student performance data instead of locally-developed or criterion-referenced instruments.
- * if locally-developed tests are used, a brief but comprehensive explanation of their reliability and validity is included in the submission to the JDRP, along with an explanation of the reason for choosing them instead of standardized tests.
- * present straightforward conclusions or trends based on well-organized, easily understandable displays of data. The JDRP failed to approve projects with abundant yet poorly organized data, as well as those that simply stated conclusions or trends without displaying supporting data.

2. Early in the project, a director must decide how to expend resources earmarked for evaluation, usually 5-8% of the total project budget. At the risk of oversimplifying, one must choose between two major alternatives:

- * a formative evaluation design that yields timely data useful for ongoing programmatic decision-making. Data collection and analysis are typically based on criterion-referenced tests, opinionnaires, observational checklists, and other unobtrusive instruments -- often locally-developed.
- * a research or quasi-research design utilizing standardized, norm-referenced tests to measure the effect of program elements, the "independent variables," in the design.

The Crookston and Fargo projects were not confronted with this decision, because standardized, norm-referenced tests were routinely administered as an integral part of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to providing appropriate educational programs for handicapped children. Their programs generated the kind of data that lends itself to a formal evaluation design.

In contrast, by emphasizing a formative evaluation in its first three years, Project U-SAIL collected considerable data that was only marginally persuasive to the JDRP as "evidence of program effectiveness."

3. Although certainly not necessary, it appears useful for the project director, or someone on the staff, to possess substantial research skills. This enables project leadership to balance effectively the often conflicting demands of delivering high quality educational projects and services with maintaining the integrity of the evaluation design.
4. The difficulty of constructing a classical research design in educational settings is well known. But even if experimental and control groups can be scientifically established, it is virtually impossible to prevent the control groups from being "contaminated" by the variable under study, that is, the new educational program. Materials and techniques of the program are shared informally by teachers, particularly in large, multi-district projects like U-SAIL and the Early Childhood Center, almost to the point of destroying the concept of experimental and control groups. In such cases, the absence of statistically significant differences in student achievement may document a breach of the research design rather than a lack of program effectiveness. However, if a control group cannot be established or its integrity maintained, there are evaluation techniques that can still generate persuasive data. Examples are the regression projection model, which compares students' estimated progress without treatment, based on past experience, to their progress in a new educational program; and the norm-referenced model, which uses national norms as the baseline.

What also struck us as we reviewed the results of the JDRP process is that projects that deliver direct services to students are more likely to be approved than those that train teachers. To the extent this is true, it calls into question the

practice of judging the effectiveness of teacher-training programs on how well their students perform. Too many uncontrolled variables enter into the situation to claim or disprove a causal relationship.

The irony is that the direct service delivery projects, which, after approval by the JDRP receive federal support under the NDN as Developer-Demonstrator projects, find themselves confronted with the task of training teachers in the use of their techniques or materials. This calls for an entirely different set of skills than delivering services to children. On the other hand, the teacher-training projects are certainly well-prepared to extend their work into other school systems around the country, but they have difficulty convincing the JDRP that their programs are effective.

5. The state-sponsored IVD evaluation process prepares a project for presenting its best case to the JDRP by affording the opportunity for a "dress rehearsal." Since IVD team members are usually selected from organizations outside a project's lines of authority and state, they can therefore point out defects in the evaluation design or its implementation without jeopardizing a working relationship. Often, this is the only objective, on-site evaluation provided a project director. If there is consensus among evaluators on what constitutes evidence of effectiveness, an IVD evaluation would certainly contribute to a more compelling presentation to the JDRP, as it did for the Fargo project.
6. A project's program officer in the state department of education may prove invaluable in serving as liaison between a project and the appropriate federal program officer or the JDRP itself depending on the state's interest in national validation. He or she can interpret JDRP guidelines, arrange through the federal program officer for a presentation date, make suggestions about the most effective format for presentation, and take care of other details. This was the experience of Project SHARE and the Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching program. Otherwise, a project director must deal directly with a program office in USOE or NIE.

Appendices

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT DISSEMINATION REVIEW PANEL

Daniel Antonoplos 254-6572
Sen. Research Associate, Meas. &
Methodology Div., Basic Skills Group
NIE, Room 819-0

Gloria Becerra 245-2961
Education Specialist
Div. of Bilingual Education, OE
421 Reporters Bldg.

John Coulson 254-6575
Research Associate, Dissemination &
Resources Group
NIE, Room 711

Albert Crambert 215/596-1033
Asst. Regional Commissioner, OE
3535 Market Street, P.O. Box 13716
Philadelphia, Penn. 19101

*Lois-ellin Datta 254-5310
Assistant Director
Education and Work Group
NIE, Room 600B

John Evans 245-8844
Office of Planning, OE
Deputy Commissioner
Room 4079, FOB 6

Edward Glassman 245-8195
Office of Planning, Budgeting
and Evaluation, OE
Room 4079, FOB 6

Jim Hamilton 245-9836
Research Coordinator
Education for the Handicapped, OE
Room 2010, ROB 3

Sidney High 245-2331
Director, Division of Career
Education Programs, OE
Room 3100, ROB 3

Howard Hjelm 245-9634
Director, Div. of Research and Demon.
Bur. of Occup. & Adult Education, OE
Room 5042, ROB 3

C. L. Hutchins 254-5868
Assistant Director, School
Practice and Service Division
NIE, Room 705B

*JDRP Chairperson

NIE: 1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208

Herbert Jacobson 245-8236
Planning Officer
Office of Indian Education
4062 FOB 6

Susan Klein 254-5928
Senior Research Associate
School Practice and Service Div.
NIE, 705B

John Schaffarzick 254-5706
Senior Researcher
Problem Solving Group
NIE, Room 815

Garry McDaniels 245-3383
Director
Div. of Innovation & Development, OE
Room 2009, ROB 3

Jean Narayanan 472-2505
Acting Chief
Eval. & Dissemination Activities, OE
Room 2031, FOB 6

Virginia Koehler 254-5407
Chief
Research on Teaching
NIE, Room 815

Jeanne Park 245-7915
Branch Chief
Information Services Div., OPA, OE
Room 2097, FOB 6

Jeffrey Schiller 254-9497
Program Head, Assessment of
Innovative Development
NIE, Room 632B

Robert Wise 254-5470
Chief, Career Awareness Div.
Education and Work Group
NIE, Room 645

Francis Sobol 254-5766
Branch Chief, Program on Teaching
Basic Skills Group
NIE, Room 816B

Saul Yanofsky 254-6090
Head, Field Research Component
Task Force for School Capacity
for Program Solving
NIE, Room 815B

USOE: 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

FORM FOR SUBMITTING MATERIALS TO THE
JOINT DISSEMINATION REVIEW PANEL

PROGRAM AREA: (e.g., Title III, reading, career education, environmental education, education for the handicapped)

- I. TITLE OF PRODUCT OR PRACTICE TO BE REVIEWED:
- II. WHO DEVELOPED THE PRODUCT OR PRACTICE:
- III. SOURCE AND LEVEL OF FUNDING:
- IV. YEARS DURING WHICH THE PRODUCT OR PRACTICE WAS BEING DEVELOPED OR TESTED:
- V. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PRODUCT OR PRACTICE FOR WHICH CLAIMS OF EFFECTIVENESS ARE BEING MADE AND THE DATA:

What is the product or practice?

What claims of effectiveness are being made?

Who are the intended users and beneficiaries?

Characteristics of the groups on which the product or practice was developed and tested.

Costs for adoption of the product or practice (See table on p. 2)

Interpretability of the quantitative measures: Evidence that the measures are reliable and valid as indicators of the effects claimed.

Credibility of evidence: who collected and analyzed the data? What assurances are there that the findings are objective?

VI. EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS:

1. Evidence that something happened: What is the evidence that something happened?
2. Evidence of statistical reliability of the effects: What is the evidence that whatever happened, happened often enough and with sufficient reliability to be likely to happen again under similar circumstances?
3. Evidence that the effects are educationally meaningful: What is the evidence that the effects are large enough, powerful enough, or important enough to be educationally meaningful, regardless of the statistical wonders performed?
4. Evidence of generalizability to the populations for which the product or practice is intended: Evidence that the product or practice has been tested widely enough and under sufficiently diverse circumstances to give assurance that the effects claimed may be similar when the product or practice is used elsewhere for the populations intended.
5. Evidence that the effects are attributable to the product or practice and that rival hypotheses (such as maturation, practice effects, etc.) are ruled out: In order to be convincing, the evaluation need not be a strict experimental design, although this type of evidence is desirable. However, there must be some kind of high quality, objective, methodologically sound, quantitative evidence demonstrating that the product and practice in question is effective and superior to other, more commonly used methods or approaches, and that the effects are caused by the product or practice.

10/12/76

VII. COST INFORMATION PER LEARNER TABLE SHELL

	INSTALLATION Non-recurring Costs	SUBSEQUENT YEARS (Recurring Costs)
Staff Training		
Special Facilities		
Equipment		
Consumables		
Other Costs		
TOTAL COSTS		

TITLE OF PROJECT: Regional Early Childhood Education and Resource Center

LOCATION: Ashland Public Schools
90 Concord Street
Ashland, MA 01721

PROGRAM AREA: Early Childhood Education
Open Education

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Early Childhood Center is primarily a teacher-training program for the open classroom. The major purpose of the Center is to serve as a resource for communities who wish to establish open education programs, by providing the in-service training of teachers, as well as the education of administrators and parents, which is necessary in order to bring about a change from the traditionally teacher-directed approach to instruction to more child-centered, flexible and informal classrooms. Within the consortium of nine towns, the Early Childhood Center provides the necessary services to teachers, parents, and administrators to enable its member towns to accomplish the desired transition. Project activities include intensive on-the-job training by a Resource Advisor for Pilot Teachers, monthly full-day curriculum workshops, ad hoc workshops in local schools, workshops and presentations for interested community groups, an open Resource Center, and monthly principal meetings/workshops.

TARGET POPULATION:

K-6 students in demonstration classes and the students of those teachers in the nine town regions directly involved in in-service training.

PROGRAM STARTING DATE: August 1, 1971

FUNDING SOURCE: ESEA Title III through July, 1975

DRP ACTION: June, 1974 - not approved
February, 1975 - not approved

TITLE OF PROJECT: Sharing High-Yield Accountability with Resource Educators
(Project SHARE)

LOCATION: Crookston Regional Interdistrict Council (RIC)
119½ N. Broadway
Crookston, Minnesota 56716
218-281-2414

PROGRAM AREA: Special Education

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project was designed to utilize a systems approach to Special Education. These systems are Administrative, Management and Advocacy, Child Study, and Instruction and Service. The basic format for serving children is behavioral rather than etiological. Precision teaching methods are utilized for diagnosis, prescription, monitoring, and evaluation.

TARGET POPULATION:

The project serves children in grades K-12 who meet the following eligibility criteria:
a) one year or more below grade level or a reasonable expectancy of becoming so; and
b) Minnesota state law as it relates to Special Education -- a student must have an identifiable handicap: perceptual, emotional, behavioral, intellectual, physical, or speech.

PROGRAM STARTING DATE: July 1, 1970

FUNDING SOURCE: ESEA Title III until June, 1975

DRP ACTION: Spring, 1974 - disapproved
January, 1975 - disapproved
May, 1975 - approved

TITLE OF PROJECT: Utah System Approach to Individualized Learning, U-SAIL

LOCATION: 1421 South 2200 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84108
801-582-1344

PROGRAM AREA: Individualized Instruction

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The major goal of this project is to develop a total individualized instructional system from kindergarten through sixth grade, and eventually through high school, to be implemented through staff development training programs for both administrators and teachers.

U-SAIL has developed curriculum support materials in mathematics, language arts, humanities, science, and early childhood education, and classroom management.

A problem-solving process is employed to install the program in sequential phases. Emphasis is placed on using the material and human resources available to best meet the needs of learners in the unique environment of each school and each classroom. The teacher's goal, for example, is to provide the most nearly appropriate task possible for a particular learner, given himself, as a teacher-learner, the time, and the resource he has available.

TARGET POPULATION:

Kindergarten to sixth grade students in project schools within eight school districts in and around Salt Lake City, Utah, specifically the school districts of: Davis, Granite, Iron, Jordan, Murray, Provo, Salt Lake, and Tooele. These school populations encompassed children who lived in the central city, rural, quasi-rural suburban, and suburban/rural areas.

PROGRAM STARTING DATE: July 1, 1970

FUNDING SOURCE: ESEA Title III

DRP ACTION: April, 1975 - disapproved
October, 1976 - approved

TITLE OF PROJECT: Pre-Kindergarten Prescriptive Teaching Program for
Disadvantaged Children with Learning Disabilities

LOCATION: 1104 Second Avenue South
Fargo, North Dakota 58102
701-235-6461

PROGRAM AREA: Early Childhood Education

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The major goal of this project is to develop and implement a curriculum for four-year-old disadvantaged children with learning disabilities. This curriculum consists of 1) a complete sequence of learning skills in several areas, 2) a minimum of one behavioral objective to accompany each learning skill, 3) performance criteria for each learning skill and objective, and 4) diagnostic tests to accompany each behavioral objective. In addition to the curriculum development, the necessary tests for screening and diagnosing children have been developed. The developed curriculum is utilized to provide the learning handicapped child with an individually prescribed instructional program designed to increase his readiness for kindergarten and remediate existing learning disabilities.

TARGET POPULATION:

Pre-kindergarten four-year-olds in the Title I area of Fargo. This area includes six public elementary schools and two parochial elementary schools.

PROGRAM STARTING DATE: July 1, 1971

FUNDING SOURCE: ESEA Title III until June, 1975

DRP ACTION: February, 1975 - approved

federal register

APPENDIX G

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1977

PART IV



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education



NATIONAL DIFFUSION NETWORK PROGRAM

Final Regulations

Title 45—Public Welfare
CHAPTER I—OFFICE OF EDUCATION, DE-
PARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

PART 193—NATIONAL DIFFUSION
NETWORK PROGRAM

Final Regulations

Pursuant to the authority contained in section 422(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1231a), a notice of proposed rulemaking for the National Diffusion Network was published in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* in 41 FR 45962-45964 on October 18, 1976 governing contract awards under the National Diffusion Network Program. The program has the purpose of promoting wide-spread installation in local school systems of already developed, rigorously evaluated, exemplary educational programs at the early childhood, elementary, secondary, and adult education levels.

I. PROGRAM PURPOSE

The National Diffusion Network is a delivery system designed to disseminate information and provide technical assistance to local school systems, public and private elementary and secondary schools, and early childhood or adult education programs in order that they may adopt exemplary elementary and secondary education, early childhood, or adult education programs, products, and practices approved for dissemination by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) of the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The JDRP serves as a quality control mechanism with respect to educational programs, products, and practices proposed for dissemination by officers or employees of the Education Division. In the course of carrying out their program responsibilities, these officers or employees identify programs, developed with Federal funds, which they believe to be sufficiently exemplary to be disseminated in order that they may be replicated or otherwise used in other settings. The JDRP reviews these and approves for dissemination by agencies of the Education Division those programs for which there is adequate evidence that they have been effective.

These JDRP approved programs make up the pool of exemplary programs, products, or practices disseminated by the National Diffusion Network for wide-spread installation in local school districts and in nonprofit private schools. The Network is designed to carry out this purpose through two approaches.

(a) *Developer-demonstrator projects* which will be awarded generally to the public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals which have already developed, with Federal funds, an exemplary program, product, or practice approved for dissemination by the JDRP. The contract recipient will receive funds to:

- (1) Develop promotional descriptive materials about the approved program.
- (2) Refine, produce, and package instructional, management, and training

materials for use in replicating the program;

(3) Share these materials and other information regarding the program, in conjunction with recipients of "Facilitator" contracts described below, with local educational agencies and schools which consider replicating the programs; and

(4) Provide training and technical assistance to these adopters which will install and use the program.

(b) *Facilitator projects*, each of which will be awarded to one or more public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals within a State or combination of adjoining States. The contract recipient will receive funds to:

(1) Engage in widespread dissemination of information to as many local school systems and schools as possible within its State or area in order to acquaint these systems and schools with the exemplary programs which have been approved for diffusion by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel;

(2) Provide technical assistance to interested local educational agencies, and schools within their State or area in considering how this program might relate to and benefit their educational needs and program activities; and

(3) Provide for necessary linkages and arrangements between local educational agencies and schools which decide to install a Network program and the appropriate Developer-Demonstrator.

As the title of the Network suggests, the National Diffusion Network is designed to promote installation of exemplary programs approved by the JDRP throughout the Nation. Developer-Demonstrator contractors will be funded to provide information, training, and technical assistance in all parts of the Nation with regard to a specific program or product. Each Facilitator contractor will concern itself with schools in a particular State or otherwise limited geographic region cutting across contiguous States. It will be a purpose of the Network program to award a substantial number of these Facilitator contracts which will collectively cover all or most of the Nation, subject of course to the quality of proposals received and limitations in available funds. It is not expected that it will be possible to cover all parts of the Nation under the Facilitator category in the initial year of funding under this part.

National Diffusion Network projects operated during FY 1976 with funds awarded late in FY 1975 pursuant to the authority of section 306 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Because the section 306, ESEA authorization has since expired, funds have been appropriated in Fiscal Year 1977 for the Network pursuant to the authority of section 422(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), an authority vested in the Commissioner of Education to disseminate information about federally supported education programs. Whereas section 306, ESEA authorized grant awards by the Commissioner, section 422(a) of the GEPA authorizes only

contracts. For this reason, awards under this part will be by way of contracts in accordance with the procedures and the requirements of Federal and HEW procurement regulations. (41 CFR Chapters 1 and 3). This part sets forth the general requirements and standards for the program.

Prior recipients of funds under the Network may compete for a contract award pursuant to this part to continue Network activities. Their proposals will be reviewed on the same basis, and under the same evaluation criteria, as a proposal from an agency or institution not previously funded under the Network.

The development of the National Diffusion Network Program has benefited from public participation in the decision-making process. During the past three years, State and local educational personnel, a representative group of Developer-Demonstrator and Facilitator project personnel, and other professionals in the area of dissemination have assisted in developing the National Diffusion Network and have participated in the implementation and operation of the Network.

II. SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Pursuant to section 431(b)(2)(A) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232(b)(2)(A)), interested parties were given thirty days to comment on the proposed regulations. Copies of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking were distributed to each Chief State School Officer, to each ESEA, Title IV State Coordinator, and to each Developer-Demonstrator and Facilitator project director participating in the National Diffusion Network. A total of twenty-five written responses were received, from nine network participants, five national organizations, three universities, two Federal agencies and from six State educational agencies. A summary of the comments and objections received and the responses of the Office of Education follow:

SUBPART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 193.1 Scope and purpose. *a. Comment.* Several commenters suggested that the regulations include provisions for private profit-making agencies as well as non-profit agencies to be eligible for a Network contract.

Response. A change has been made in §§ 193.11 and 193.21 to include the awarding of contracts to public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals.

b. Comment. A commenter suggested including provisions for the establishment of a central collection, assembly, and distribution of National Diffusion Network materials to the Network participants.

Response. No change has been made in the regulation. It is intended that the Division of Educational Replication within the U.S. Office of Education will act as a central coordinating unit for the Network.

c. Comment. A suggestion was made to expand the Network to include programs

validated through use of the State Identification, Validation, and Dissemination (IVD) procedures, a State review process for identifying and validating exemplary, Federally funded ESEA, Title III programs.

Response. No change has been made in the regulations. The Office of Education recognizes the Identification, Validation, and Dissemination (IVD) process as a procedure which has been used by States to identify and validate outstanding programs and practices for diffusion and replication within the State in which the program was developed. It also recognizes the contributions that the IVD process has made to improving the quality of evaluation designs primarily for programs and practices developed with ESEA, Title III funds. The policy of the Office of Education, however, is that only those programs, products and practices which have been examined for effectiveness by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel and approved for dissemination may receive funds as Developer-Demonstrators. The JDRP serves as a quality control mechanism to ensure that Federal funds do not support dissemination of programs or products for which there is no evidence of effectiveness. IVD validated programs and practices may be submitted to the JDRP and if approved are eligible to receive funds as Developer-Demonstrators and to participate in the National Diffusion Network.

Section 193.2 Definitions. a. Comment. Several commenters requested a statement to be included in the definitions providing for early childhood education programs and adult education programs approved for diffusion by the JDRP.

Response. These suggestions have been incorporated in the regulations.

b. Comment. A commenter raised several questions and made suggestions concerning procedures used by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel. The Commenter, however, did not suggest that changes be made in the regulation.

Response. A copy of the commenter's letter has been sent to the Chairman of the Joint Dissemination Review Panel and to the Commissioner of Education for consideration and possible modification of present procedures.

SUBPART B—DEVELOPER-DEMONSTRATOR PROJECTS

Section 193.11 Eligibility for awards. a. Comment. A commenter suggested that the Network should include programs developed with State or local funds if approved for dissemination by the Education Division's JDRP.

Response. No change has been made in the regulations. The authorizing legislation which supports the Network, section 422(a) of the General Education Provisions Act, limits the programs that may be disseminated by the NDN to those programs that were developed with Federal funds.

b. Comment. Several comments were received requesting that a Developer-Demonstrator project be able to transfer operation to an agency other than the one at the original developer site.

Response. Changes have been made in § 193.11 of the regulation to incorporate this suggestion.

Section 193.12 Project activities. Comment. A commenter asked that the National Diffusion Network provide funds for replicators of Developer-Demonstrator programs.

Response. No change has been made in the regulation. Developer-Demonstrator Projects and Facilitator Projects provide training and technical assistance to adopters and in some cases, where funds permit, may also provide some additional travel and supplies for adopters. Adopting schools, however, are expected to pay for all operational costs associated with the program from funds from other sources.

Section 193.14 Funding criteria. Comment. Several commenters proposed that the regulations include provisions to enable potential adopters to visit an adopter site of the program in addition to the originating site.

Response. A change has been made in § 193.14(c) of the regulations to provide for an adopter site to be used for observation as long as the site meets the basic specifications of the original project.

Section 193.21 Eligibility for awards. Comment. A commenter suggested that the regulations should emphasize a State-based facilitator rather than a facilitator project which serves segments of a State, or more than one State.

Response. No change in the regulation is deemed necessary. In general, the Office of Education expects to fund Facilitators which serve a single State. Some States, however, because of regional arrangements within a State have in the past found that more than one facilitator within a State was desirable. Also, two States in the past chose to enter into an arrangement which provided for a single facilitator to serve the two States. The regulation is flexible enough to accommodate situations of this type on the same basis as a single State project.

Section 193.22 Project activities. a. Comment. A commenter proposed collaboration between Facilitators and other State agencies dealing in dissemination activities.

Response. No change in the regulations is deemed necessary. Even though collaboration between Facilitators and other State agencies is not required, points are given in the criteria for collaboration with other State agencies having dissemination objectives and responsibilities. Federal requirements on this do not seem appropriate.

b. Comment. Several commenters proposed that technical assistance be provided an adopter site during the implementation phase.

Response. A new paragraph (g) has been added to § 193.22 to provide for such technical assistance.

c. Comment. Several commenters requested that Facilitator funds be made available to adopters to cover costs associated with the adoption of a Developer-Demonstrator program when circumstances warrant assistance.

Response. A change has been made by adding § 193.25 which provides that Facilitators may assist adopters with the purchase of educational materials and provide funds for technical assistance to install a Developer-Demonstrator program.

d. Comment. Commenters requested that all Joint Dissemination Review Panel approved programs be included in the National Diffusion Network for dissemination and not be limited just to those programs receiving funds as Developer-Demonstrator Projects.

Response. A change has been made in the regulations. All approved JDRP programs will be included for purposes of providing information by Facilitators in the Network. Only those JDRP approved programs which are funded as Developer-Demonstrators, however, will be able to provide training and technical assistance to potential adopters.

Section 193.23 Proposal requirements. Comment. A comment was received requesting that national nonprofit organizations be able to operate Facilitator projects which are national in scope, as opposed to those which are local or regional in scope.

Response. No change has been made in the regulation. Based upon previous experience with the National Diffusion Network, the Office of Education does not believe that a single Facilitator serving all States can provide the numerous personal interactions with local school districts and private nonprofit schools in all States which are necessary for: (a) Matching local needs with possible solutions, and (b) providing training and other technical assistance during the installation process. Past experience indicates that Facilitators which serve a single State or a region within a State can provide these personal interactions. The Office of Education hopes to develop a self sustaining capacity within each State. This capacity would be lost if Facilitators were funded to serve the nation.

Section 193.24 Funding criteria. Comment. Several commenters felt that the value placed on item (f) entitled "Prior experience" penalized States not currently having a Facilitator but who desire to respond to a request for proposal.

Response. The prior experience criterion has been deleted.

III. Other changes. (a) Minor changes have been made to correct clerical errors or technical inconsistencies in subparts B and C.

(b) Additional items have been included to reflect the relationship that cost has to the funding of a proposal and to establish a basis for programmatic and financial reporting.

(c) Other changes have been made based upon recommendations of the Office of Education Grant and Procurement Division to assure that the regulations conform to contract requirements.

(d) Amendments have been made to § 193.24 to clarify that the Commissioner in awarding Facilitator contracts, will seek to cover as many States as possible.

IV. *Adoption of regulations.* After considering all comments, the Commissioner hereby adopts the proposed regulations which were published in the *FEDERAL REGISTER* on October 18, 1976, with the noted changes, as set forth below.

V. *Effective date.* Pursuant to section 431(d) of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1232 (d)), these regulations have been transmitted to the Congress concurrently with the publication of this document in the *FEDERAL REGISTER*. That section provides that regulations subject thereto shall become effective on the forty-fifth day following the date of such transmission subject to the provisions therein concerning Congressional action and adjournment.

NOTE.—The Office of Education has determined that this document does not contain a major proposal requiring preparation of an Inflation Impact Statement under Executive Order 11821 and OMB Circular A-107.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 13.874, National Diffusion Network-Dissemination)

Dated: December 29, 1976.

JOHN W. EVANS,
(Acting) U.S. Commissioner
of Education.

Approved: December 29, 1976.

DAVID MATHEWS,
Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare.

Subpart A—General Provisions

Sec.

- 193.1 Scope and purpose.
- 193.2 Definitions.
- 193.3 Award procedures.
- 193.4-193.10 [Reserved]

Subpart B—Developer-Demonstrator Projects

- 193.11 Eligibility for awards.
- 193.12 Project activities.
- 193.13 Proposal requirements.
- 193.14 Funding criteria.
- 193.15 Allowable costs.
- 193.16-193.20 [Reserved]

Subpart C—Facilitator Projects

- 193.21 Eligibility for awards.
- 193.22 Project activities.
- 193.23 Proposal requirements.
- 193.24 Funding criteria.
- 193.25 Allowable costs.

AUTHORITY: Sec. 422(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1231a); Pub. L. 94-439 (1976); H.R. Rep. No. 94-1219 at 67 (1976).

Subpart A—General Provisions

§ 193.1 Scope and purpose.

(a) *Scope.* The regulations in this part govern contract awards with funds appropriated for purposes of the National Diffusion Network pursuant to section 422(a) of the General Education Provisions Act. Contract awards under this part are subject to applicable provisions contained in 41 CFR Chapters 1 and 3.

(b) *Purpose.* The purpose of this part is to provide for the award of contracts to public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals, to promote the widespread installation in public and

private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, early childhood education programs and education programs for adults who do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education and who have not achieved an equivalent level of education, of rigorously evaluated, exemplary educational programs, products, or practices already developed with Federal support. (References hereinafter to "schools" shall include public and private nonprofit schools and programs providing education at these levels.) The program will be designed to acquaint schools throughout the Nation with exemplary, Federally funded programs and, if the schools decide to adopt these programs, to assist them in doing so through the provision of information, technical assistance, and training.

§ 193.2 Definitions.

The following definitions shall apply to the terms used in this Part:

(a) "Joint Dissemination Review Panel" or "JDRP" refers to the panel of that name within the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and composed of employees of the Office of Education, the National Institute of Education, and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, which review: educational programs, products, and practices submitted to it by employees of the Education Division for effectiveness and approves them for national dissemination.

(20 U.S.C. 1221b, 1221c, 1221e.)

(b) "Local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(20 U.S.C. 881(f).)

(c) "State" means in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(20 U.S.C. 881(j).)

§ 193.3 Award procedures.

Awards under this part shall be in the form of competitive contracts and shall be governed by the applicable provisions of Federal and Department procurement regulations contained in 41 CFR Chapters 1 and 3.

§§ 193.4-193.10 [Reserved]

Subpart B—Developer-Demonstrator Projects

§ 193.11 Eligibility for awards.

(a) A proposal for a Developer-Demonstrator project may be submitted by any public or private agency, organization, group, or individual that has developed, with Federal support, an exemplary educational program, product, or practice which has been previously approved for dissemination by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP).

(b) If the agency which developed the program approved by the JDRP does not apply for a Developer-Demonstrator Project, another agency, organization, group or individual may apply for a Developer-Demonstrator Project award for the JDRP approved program, if the program continues to be operated at the original site and is available for potential adopter visitation and observation, and if the staff which will perform the project activities is composed substantially of staff members who originally developed and operated the project.

§ 193.12 Project activities.

A Developer-Demonstrator Project contract will be awarded for the purpose of carrying out the following activities:

(a) Disseminating information on a nationwide basis, in conjunction with recipients of Facilitator Awards under Subpart C, about the exemplary educational program previously approved by the JDRP;

(b) Developing materials about the approved program to be used by recipients of Facilitator contracts under Subpart C, and local educational agencies, and schools before a local educational agency or school decides to adopt the approved program;

(c) Refining, producing, and packaging instructional, management, and training materials related to the approved program for use with local educational agencies and schools after they have decided to adopt the program;

(d) Providing training and technical assistance to local educational agencies and schools which decide to adopt the approved program in planning for, initiating, and carrying out the program;

(e) Participating in workshops and meetings arranged for by the Commissioner to share information among Network contractors and provide technical assistance to them; and

(f) Evaluating the effectiveness of the diffusion and adoption process including evaluating the data received from the adopter on the effectiveness of program installation.

(20 U.S.C. 1231a; Pub. L. 94-439 (1976); H.R. Rep. No. 1120 at 67 (1976).)

§ 193.13 Proposal requirements.

A proposal for a Developer-Demonstrator Contract award under this subpart must meet the following requirements, in addition to such other require-

ments as may be set forth in applicable contract documents. The proposal must:

(a) Identify and describe the specific program, product, or practice to be disseminated and document that the program, product, or practice was developed with Federal support and has been approved for dissemination by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel;

(b) Provide for the carrying out of all of the project activities described in § 193.12 and describe the strategies to be used in carrying out these activities;

(c) Set forth a management and an evaluation plan for the project;

(d) Document that the program, product, or practice remains in current use at the site at which it was developed and explain the manner and nature of the current use;

(e) Provide for quarterly reports of such data as is required to measure progress during the project, and a final report due ninety days after the completion of the project, including in the final report recommendations for improving future activities;

(f) Document, if the offeror is other than the original developer of the JDRP approved program, that the program will continue to operate at the original site and be available for visitation by potential adopters and that staff members who originally developed and operated the JDRP approved program will provide training and technical assistance to potential adopters and will participate in other program activities.

§ 193.14 Funding criteria.

In evaluating proposals for Developer-Demonstrator Projects, the Commissioner will apply the following criteria:

(a) *High quality.* (17 points). The extent the proposed project is designed to achieve high quality (beyond meeting minimum requirements) with respect to each of the project activities described in § 193.12;

(b) *Management.* (13 points). The quality of the management and evaluation plans described in the proposal;

(c) *Access to developer site.* (9 points). The extent the proposal provides for access of potential adopters who may wish to visit the ongoing project at the original site and, at the option of the contract recipient, at any additional adopter site in which the program meets the basic specifications of the program at the original site;

(d) *Personnel.* (20 points). Adequacy of educational background and experience of proposed staff members to perform the requirements specified in the RFP including items such as: educational training, experience in the development and operation of a JDRP approved program, and related education and experience in dissemination and staff training.

(e) *Facilities and resources.* (9 points). Adequacy of facilities and other resources;

(f) *Innovative strategies.* (9 points). The extent the proposal provides for innovative dissemination strategies which may be worthy of replication by other Network projects; and

(g) *Cost effectiveness.* (9 points). The cost effectiveness of the project with respect to the number of States, schools, and students to be served.

§ 193.15 Allowable costs.

Allowable costs under awards pursuant to this part will be determined in accordance with the cost principles described in 41 CFR Parts 1-15, and may include the costs of employing a small staff to carry out the activities described in § 193.12.

§§ 193.16-193.20 [Reserved]

Subpart C—Facilitator Projects

§ 193.21 Eligibility for awards.

A proposal for a Facilitator Project may be submitted by a public or private agency, organization, group or individual located in the State or region to be served.

§ 193.22 Project activities.

A Facilitator Project contract will be awarded for carrying out the following activities directed to local educational agencies and schools in the State or combination of adjoining States to be served under the project:

(a) Informing local educational agencies and schools about exemplary programs in the National Diffusion Network (i.e., those programs which have been approved for diffusion by the Education Division's Joint Dissemination Review Panel);

(b) Assisting local educational agencies and schools in determining the appropriateness of National Diffusion Network programs for their schools in terms of their assessed needs;

(c) Arranging for potential adopters to visit Demonstrator sites when appropriate;

(d) Arranging for Developer-Demonstrators to train staff members in public and private schools which want to install one or more of the Network programs;

(e) Coordinating the provision of the services described in paragraphs (a) through (d) of this section to local agencies and schools on the most cost-effective basis;

(f) Participating in workshops and meetings arranged for by the Commissioner to share information among Network contractors and provide technical assistance to them; and

(g) Providing technical assistance to adopters after programs have been installed.

§ 193.23 Proposal requirements.

A proposal for a Facilitator Project under this subpart must meet the following requirements, in addition to such other requirements as may be set forth

in the applicable request for proposal. The proposal must:

(a) Identify the State, region within a State, or combination of adjacent States to be served under the project (The area to be served as a result of any contract will be negotiated after the technical evaluation);

(b) Provide for the carrying out of all of the project activities described in § 193.22 and describe the strategies to be used in carrying out these activities;

(c) Document, by attaching to the proposal a letter from each Chief State School Officer or through other appropriate documentation, that the Chief State School Officer for each State to be served by the project has been consulted in the development of the proposal;

(d) Set forth a management and an evaluation design for the project;

(e) Provide for quarterly reports on such data as are required to measure progress during the project, and a final report ninety days after the completion of the project, including in the final report recommendations for improving future activities.

§ 193.24 Funding criteria.

(a) Awards will cover as many States as possible with consideration given to the number of children within the State, and the quality and nature of services to be provided as evaluated based upon criteria in this section.

(b) In evaluating proposals for Facilitator Projects, the Commissioner will apply the following criteria:

(1) *High quality.* (17 points). The extent the proposed project is designed to achieve high quality (beyond meeting minimum requirements) with respect to each of the project activities described in § 193.22;

(2) *Management and evaluation.* (13 points). The quality of the management and evaluation plans described by the proposal;

(3) *Personnel.* (20 points). Adequacy of educational background and experience of proposed staff members to perform the requirements specified in the RFP including: education and experience in educational administration and management, dissemination and diffusion, and related experience as change agents or linkers.

(4) *Facilities and resources.* (9 points). Adequacy of facilities and other resources;

(5) *Innovation.* (9 points). The extent the proposal provides for innovative dissemination strategies which may be worthy of replication by other Facilitator projects;

(6) *Consultation during proposal development.* (12 points). The extent the offeror has, in the development of the proposal, consulted with State and local educational agencies, private elementary and secondary schools, and other educational resources in the State or States to be served by the project;

RULES AND REGULATIONS

(7) *Consultation during project operation.* (12 points). The extent the proposal provides for consultation by the contractor, in the carrying out of the project, with State and local educational agencies, private elementary and secondary schools, and other educational resources in the State or States to be served by the project.

(8) *Cost effectiveness.* (9 points). Cost effectiveness of the project with respect to the number of schools, programs, and students to be served.

§ 193.25 Allowable costs.

Allowable costs under awards pursuant to this part will be determined in accordance with the cost principles described in 41 CFR Parts 1-15, and may include the costs of employing a small staff to carry out the activities described in § 193.22. Depending upon the availability of funds, allowable costs may include assistance to adopters with the purchase of educational materials and technical assistance related to the installation of the program.

[FR Doc. 77-565 Filed 1-4-77; 8:45 am]

STATE FACILITATORS

Mr. John L. Hayman
Director
AIDS - State Facilitator
Alabama Department of Education
Room 347 - State Office Building
Montgomery, Alabama 36130
(205) 832-3318

Mr. John M. Stamm
Director
Southcentral Regional Resource Center
650 International Airport Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99502
(907) 276-4524

Dr. L. Leon Webb
Director
Educational Diffusion Systems, Inc.
161 East 1st Street
Mesa, Arizona 85201
(602) 959-6710

Dr. Sara Murphy
Facilitator
Arkansas Department of Education
Arch Ford Education Building
State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201
(501) 371-2276

Ms. Mary B. Gunter
Boston Mount Cooperation
Drawer 188
Prairie Grove, Arkansas 72753

Ms. Pat Flanagan
Marianna School District
557 Carolina Street
Marianna, Arkansas 72360

Mr. Frank L. Wallace
State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-5272

Dr. Duane C. Webb
Project Director
Northern Colorado BOCES
830 South Lincoln
Longmont, Colorado 80501
(303) 772-4420

Mr. Harry Osgood
Project Director
Educational Resources Center
Area Cooperative Educational Services
800 Dixwell Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut 06511
(203) 562-9967

Mr. Wilmer E. Wise
Director
Planning, Resource, and Evaluation
Division
State Department of Public Instruction
John G. Townsend Building
Dover, Delaware 19901
(302) 678-4583

Mr. Dennis E. Collins
District Facilitator Project*
1101 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 331-1707, Ext. 37 or 38

Mr. Allen Scott
Project Coordinator
Florida Facilitator Center
411 West Boulevard
Chipley, Florida 32428
(904) 638-4131

Mr. John G. Holter
Director
West Georgia CESA
1090 East Depot Street
LaGrange, Georgia 30240
(404) 882-0007

Mr. E. G. McCants
Director of CSRA - CESA
P.O. Box 868
Thomson, Georgia 30824
(404) 595-6990

Mr. Jack B. Holcomb
Project Director
North Georgia CESA
P.O. Box 657
Ellijay, Georgia 30540
(404) 635-5391

Mr. Travis J. Ouzts, Jr.
Director
Heart of Georgia School System CESA
Box 348
Eastman, Georgia 31023
(912) 374-2240

*Serving the District of Columbia schools.

Dr. Charles Florida
Director
Northwest Georgia CESA
Rt. 1, Box 255
Cedartown, Georgia 30125
(404) 684-5443

Mr. Robert N. Shigley
Project Director
Pioneer Cooperative Educational Service
Agency
P.O. Box 548
Cleveland, Georgia 30528
(404) 865-2141

Mrs. Jean Mays
Project Director
Okefenokee Cooperative Educational
Services Agency (CESA)
Route 5, Box 406
Waycross, Georgia 31501
(912) 285-6151

Mr. W. J. Raines
Director
Middle Georgia Cooperative Educational
Service Agency
P.O. Box 772
Fort Valley, Georgia 31030
(912) 825-3132

Mr. W. Allen Smith
Director
Coastal Plains CESA
Box 1265
1200 Williams Street
Valdosta, Georgia 31601
(912) 247-3482

Dr. Robert E. Flanders
Director
Griffin CESA
P.O. Drawer H
Griffin, Georgia 30224
(404) 227-0632

Dr. H. Boyd Israel
Director
Southwest Georgia CESA
P.O. Box 145
Leary, Georgia 31762
(912) 792-6195

Mr. William Wesley Hill
Project Director
Oconee CESA
P.O. Box 699
Sandersville, Georgia 31062
(912) 552-5178

Mr. Daniel H. Cromer
Generalist
Northeast Georgia CESA
225 Fain Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602
(404) 542-7675

Mr. Ted L. Lindley
Project Director
State Department of Education
Jordan Office Building
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 384-2189

Ms. Shirley Menendez
Project Director
PIPs Diffusion Service Center
P.O. Box 29
Metropolis, Illinois 62960
(618) 524-9909

Mr. John S. Hand
Project Director
Indiana Facilitator Center
Logansport Community School Corp.
2829 George Street
Logansport, Indiana 46947
(219) 753-4343

Mr. Phillip Thomas
Director of Educational Improvement and
Development
State Department of Education
120 East 10th
Topeka, Kansas 66612
(913) 296-3128

Mr. Ralph Parish
Director, KEDDS/LINK
670 North Edgemoor
Wichita, Kansas 67208
(316) 685-0271

Mr. John C. Padgett
Project Director
Kentucky Statewide Facilitator Project
Kentucky Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
(502) 564-4394

Mr. Dan Lewis
Project Director
Louisiana State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
(504) 389-2501

Mr. Robert Shafto
Project Director
Maine Facilitator Center
P.O. Box 1391
Gardiner, Maine 04345
(207) 582-7211

Dr. Raymond H. Hartjen
Project Director
P.O. Box 265 - Simms Landing Road
Port Tobacco, Maryland 20677
(301) 934-2998

Mr. Dennis E. Collins
Project Director, MDAP
Network of Innovative Schools, Inc.
290 South Main Street
Andover, Massachusetts 01810
(617) 470-1030

Ms. Deborah Clemmons
Michigan Department of Education
Box 30008
Lansing, Michigan 48909
(517) 373-1806

Mr. Richard Hegre
Project Director
Staples Public Schools
Independent School District #793
Staples, Minnesota 56479
(218) 894-2430, Ext. 215

Ms. Diane Lassman
Project Director
Minneapolis Public Schools
807 N.E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413
(612) 376-5297

Dr. Richard L. Peterson
Project Director
SW & WC Educational Cooperative Service
Unit
Southwest State University
Marshall, Minnesota 56258
(507) 537-6234

Mr. Lamar Nesbit
Executive Director, Mississippi School
Boards
623 Bankers Trust Plaza Building
P.O. Box 1801
Jackson, Mississippi 39205
(601) 948-1210

Ms. Jolene Schulz
Project Director
Missouri Facilitator Center
Columbia Public School System
310 North Providence
Columbia, Missouri 65201
(314) 449-8622

Mr. Glenn Clarkson
Project Director
Bellevue Public Schools
2009 Franklin Street
Bellevue, Nebraska 68005
(402) 733-5215

Mr. Glendon C. Belden
Director
Supervisory Union #56
414 High Street
Somersworth, New Hampshire 03878
(603) 224-9461

Dr. Evelyn Ogden
New Jersey State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-8360

Dr. Lily A. Klot
Project Director
Diffusing Exemplary Education Practices
in New Mexico
Department of Educational Foundations
College of Education
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131
(505) 277-5141

Mr. Robert King
New York State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234
(518) 474-1280

Mr. Henry A. Helms, Jr.
Director
Division of Development
N. C. Department of Public Instruction
Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611
(919) 733-7018

Mr. Hank Landeis
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
(701) 224-2391

Dr. Raymond D. Hinrichs
Coordinator
Ohio Facilitation Center
The Ohio Department of Education
65 South Front Street, Room 804
Columbus, (Franklin), Ohio 43215
(614) 466-4833

Mr. Darrell L. Garrison
Statewide Facilitator
Edmond Public Schools
1216 S. Rankin
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034
(405) 341-2246

Mr. Jack E. Allen and
Dr. Dick Pedee
State Facilitator
Multnomah County Intermediate Education
District
220 S.E. 102nd Avenue
Portland, Multnomah, Oregon 97216
(503) 255-1841, Ext. 149

Mr. Richard Brickley
Project Director
Montgomery County Intermediate Unit
Research & Information Services for
Education
McGinnis Building
6198 Butler Pike
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19422
(215) 265-6056

Mr. Alan Sinclair
Rhode Island Department of Education
199 Promenade Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
(401) 277-2841

Mr. James Buckner
State Facilitator
S. C. State Department of Education
Rutledge Building
Columbia, South Carolina 29201
(803) 758-2911

Mr. Thomas C. Todd
State Superintendent
South Dakota Division of Elementary
and Secondary Education
New State Office Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 224-3243

Mr. Charles M. Achilles
Project Director
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Ms. Virginia Cutter
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 475-5601

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay
Utah State Board of Education
250 East Fifth South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 533-5891

Mr. Joseph O'Brien
Project Director
Bennington-Rutland Supervisory Union
Manchester, Center, Vermont 05255

Mr. Keith Wright
Project Director
Yakima School District #7
104 N. 4th Avenue
Yakima, Washington 98902
(509) 575-3234

Mr. Alpha Wilson
West Virginia Department of Education
Building 6, Capitol Complex
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Mr. Arnold Chandler
Director
Department of Public Instruction
Instructional Services Division
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702
(608) 266-2630

Ms. Charlene Stogsdill
State Facilitator
Laramie County School District #1
School Administration Building
2810 House Avenue
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001
(307) 632-0591

Mr. Earl Mortensen
Virgin Islands Department of Education
St. Thomas, Virgin Islands 00801
(809) 774-0100

NEW DEVELOPER-DEMONSTRATORS

ARIZONA

Dr. Theresa Howard
Director
Arizona Consortium for Individualized
Learning
4643 E. Thomas Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85018
(602) 959-6710

CALIFORNIA

Ms. Karen Chatham
Experienced-Based Career Education (EBCE)
Far West Laboratory
1855 Folsom Street
San Francisco, California 94103
(415) 565-3133

COLORADO

Dr. Glyn H. Sharpe
Director
Project STAMM
Jefferson County Schools
1209 Quail
Lakewood, Colorado 80215
(303) 234-7000

FLORIDA

Dr. Ralph Bailey
Director
Pupil Personnel Services Demonstration
Project
School Board of Pinellas County,
Florida
1960 E. Druid Road
Clearwater, Florida 33518
(813) 821-5260

Mrs. Louise Sears
Project Director
Title I Reading Center
School Board of Broward County,
Florida
1320 S.W. 4th Street
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33312
(305) 581-6410

Mrs. Audrey Jackson
School Volunteer Program
School Board of Dade County, Florida
1444 Biscayne Boulevard, Room 312
Miami, Florida 33132
(305) 371-2491

FLORIDA (Cont.)

Mrs. Mary Dorsey
Director
Florida Department of Education
Migrant Education Section, Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32304
(305) 735-6110

GEORGIA

Mrs. Marcelyn Hobbs
Project Director
Reading/English Rotation Project
McDuffie County Board of Education
P.O. Box 952
Thomson, Georgia 30824
(404) 595-3523

IOWA

Mrs. Marion Hazelton
Project Director
Pre-School Education for Disadvantaged
Children in Title I (PREDICT I)
Cedar Rapids Community Schools
346 2nd Avenue Southwest
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404
(319) 398-2111

KANSAS

Mrs. Jane Connett
Director
Project DEEP
Wichita High School South
701 West 33rd Street South
Wichita, Kansas 67217
(316) 522-2233

MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. Theresa G. Murphy
Andover's Individualized Reading System
(AIRS)
Andover Public Schools
36 Bartlett Street
Andover, Massachusetts 01810
(617) 475-2339

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Dorothy Neff
Project Director
Discovery Through Reading
Clarkston Community Schools
6389 Clarkston Road
Clarkston, Michigan 48016
(313) 625-3330

NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. William Blackmore
Project Director
Project Reading Improvement
Pender County Schools
Burgaw, North Carolina 28425
(919) 259-2188

OKLAHOMA

Mr. Jim Mason
Director, Developer-Demonstrator Project
The Oklahoma Child Service Demonstration
Center
Hillside School
Cushing, Oklahoma 74023
(918) 225-1882

TEXAS

Mrs. Elaine Shelton
Director
APL Project, ExB 202
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712
(512) 471-4623

UTAH

Dr. Ethna Reid
Partner
Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction
2888 Highland Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106
(801) 486-5083

Dr. Carma M. Hales
Director
Utah System Approach to Individualized
Learning (U-SAIL)
P.O. Box 9327
2971 Evergreen Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109
(801) 486-5491

WASHINGTON

Mrs. Louise Gustafson
Director
Training Migrant Para-Professionals in
Bilingual Mini Head Start
Educational Service District #123
Box 2367
Pasco, Washington 99302
(509) 547-8442

Dr. Alice Hayden
Director
Early Childhood Developer-Demonstrator
Project
University of Washington
College of Education
Seattle, Washington 98195
(206) 543-7583

OLD DEVELOPER-DEMONSTRATORS

Mrs. Sarah Waldrop
Co-Director
Talents Unlimited
1107 Arlington Street
Mobile, Alabama 33606
(205) 690-8055

Mr. Otis H. Brunson
Co-Director
Talents Unlimited
1107 Arlington Street
Mobile, Alabama 33606
(205) 690-8055

Dr. Marie Sinclair
Project PEGASUS-PACE: Continuous
Progress Reading Program
Tuscaloosa Board of Education
1100 21st Street, East
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35401
(205) 758-2323 - Home
(205) 759-5705 - Office

Mr. John Lavender
Project Director
Occupational Versatility
Division of Technology
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281
(602) 965-7410

Mr. Philip K. Glossa
or Mr. Orval S. Hillman
Learning to Read by Reading
P.O. Box 497
Jamestown, California 95327
(209) 984-5291, Ext. 6

Ms. Fay Harbison
CATCH-UP
1601 Sixteenth Street
Newport Beach, California 92553
(714) 556-3300

Mr. John Mason Hill
Program Coordinator
Right to Read Wilson Jr. High School
Woodrow Wilson Junior High
3838 Orange Avenue
San Diego, California 92105
(714) 280-1661, Ext. 22

Ms. Pauline E. Perazzo
Project R-3 Reading, Relevance, and
Reinforcement
1635 Park Avenue
San Jose, California 95126
(408) 287-1111

Mrs. Gretchen Ross
Director, Alphaphonics Reading Readiness
Training Program
Ponderosa School
295 Ponderosa Road
South San Francisco, California 94080
(415) 588-8082

Ms. Betty Benjamin
Project Director - Added Dimensions to
Parent and Preschool Education
Early Childhood Education
Jefferson County Public Schools
1209 Quail Street
Lakewood, Colorado 80215
(303) 234-7000, Ext. 346

Mr. Chris Angerman
or Mr. Geoffry Smith
Co-Directors
Project High School in the Community and
Community Planning Council for
Educational Alternatives
45 Nash Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06510
(203) 624-1357

Dr. Nathan Farber
Project Manager
Early Childhood Preventive Curriculum
Demonstration Center (ECPC)
9240 S.W. 124th Street
Miami, Florida 33176
(305) 238-2250 - Home
(305) 251-5445 - Office

Mrs. June Johnson
Director, New Adventure in Learning (NAIL)
W. J. Moore Elementary School
Route 17
Tallahassee, Florida 32303
(904) 877-8595

Mrs. Martha F. Owens
Project Director, Every Child A Winner
Box 141
Ocilla, Georgia 31774
(912) 468-7098

Mr. Charles Pelan, Director
or Mr. John Zirges
Inservice Specialist/Evaluator
PATL: Positive Attitude Toward Learning
Bethalto Unit #8 Schools
322 E. Central
Bethalto, Illinois 62010
(618) 377-5211

Mrs. Luceille Werner
Early Prevention of School Failure
114 N. Second Street
Peotone, Illinois 60468
(312) 258-3478
(312) 258-3444

Mr. Kenneth D. Barker
Project Director
Pilot Project Utilizing Supportive
Personnel Using Behavior Modification
Techniques with Articulatory Disordered
Children, Area Ed1. Ag. #16
1340 Mt. Pleasant Street
Burlington, Iowa 52601
(319) 754-5771

Mr. Ron Curtis
Project Director
MEDIA NOW
S.W. Iowa Learning Resources Center
401 Reed Street
Red Oak, Iowa 51566
(712) 623-4913

Mrs. Lynn Riggs
Director, Project HOME START: Family-
Centered Preschool Enrichment
Div. of Research, Evaluation and
Development
Waterloo Community School District
6028 Kimball
Waterloo, Iowa 50701
(319) 233-8491

Dr. Steven T. Holbrook
Director, Project HOME START: Family-
Centered Preschool Enrichment
Div. of Research, Evaluation and
Development
Waterloo Community School District
1516 Washington Street
Waterloo, Iowa 50702
(319) 233-5281

Mr. Donald R. Alwes, Director
or Ms. Phyllis A. Rees, Assistant Director
Re-Ed School
1804 Bluegrass Avenue
Louisville, Kentucky 40215
(502) 366-9385

Ms. Anna Hundley
Project Learning Disabilities
Early Identification and Intervention
731 St. Charles Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
(504) 524-8592, Ext. 351

Mr. Robert Lentz, Director
or Ms. Mary Smith, Associate Director
Project Adventure
P.O. Box 157
Hamilton, Massachusetts 01936
(617) 468-1766

Ms. Diane K. Bert
Parent Readiness Education Project (PREP)
Redford Union School District #1
18499 Beech Daly Road
Detroit, Michigan 48240
(313) 535-2000, Ext. 210

Mr. Herb Escott, Director
or Ms. Sonja Tweedie
Dissemination Project FAST
Essexville-Hampton Public Schools
303 Pine Street
Essexville, Michigan 48732
(517) 893-4533

Dr. Mary Hammarback, Director
or Mrs. Fay Hammarback, Coordinator
Project SHARE: Sharing High-Yield
Accountability with Resource Educators
Route 1
Hendrum, Minnesota 56550
(218) 784-4826

Dr. Donald B. Sension
Demonstration Evaluation Center (CAM)
Hopkins Schools
1001 Highway #7
Hopkins, Minnesota 55343
(612) 935-5571, Ext. 230

Ms. Eileen Ostergaard
Project Coordinator
Vocational Reading Power, MIMC
3554 White Bear Avenue
White Bear Lake, Minnesota 55110
(612) 770-3943

Mr. Fred Hayman
Co-Director
Vocational Reading Power
166 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 376-4580

Ms. Sue Schillinger
Project Coordinator, FOCUS
Human Resource Associates, Inc.
121 East Second Street
Hastings, Minnesota 55413
(612) 436-8631
(612) 437-3976

Ms. Elaine Wray
Project Director
Family Oriented Structured Preschool
Activity Personalized - Seton Hall
Preschool
1204 7th Street, South
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301
(612) 253-5828

Ms. Diane Rudquist
Project Director
St. Paul Open School
97 Central Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 224-9421

Ms. Alta M. Harness
Director, Conceptually Oriented
Mathematics Program (COMP)
1414 I-70 Drive, S.W.
Columbia, Missouri 65201
(314) 449-0881

Ms. Marion M. Wilson
Director, SATURDAY SCHOOL: Parent-Child
Early Education Program
Ferguson Reorganized School District
655 January Avenue
Ferguson, Missouri 63135
(314) 595-2355 or 2354

Dr. Ray Beck
Director, Remediation for Children with
Learning Deficits through Precision
Teaching: The Sacajawea Plan
Special Education Center
801 2nd Avenue No.
Great Falls, Montana 58401
(406) 791-2270

Mr. Glenn Clarkson
Project Director, Project INSTRUCT
(Instructional Systems for Teaching
Reading Using Continuous-Progress
Technology)
Bellevue Public Schools
2009 Franklin Street
Bellevue, Nebraska 68510
(402) 733-5215

Mr. Robert H. Ostdiek
Director
Engineered Classroom for Students who are
both Educably, Mentally Handicapped
and Behaviorally Maladjusted
420 S. Washington Street
Papillion, Nebraska 68046
(402) 399-3411

Mr. Richard Metteer
Director, Project Success for the SLD
Child
West Middle School
312 Douglas
Wayne, Nebraska 68787
(402) 375-2230

Mr. Thomas Rookey
Executive Director
EIC
50 Lake Drive
Highstown, New Jersey 08520
(609) 448-0484

Dr. Thomas M. Vodola
Director, Project ACTIVE
(All Children Totally Involved in
Exercising)
Ocean Township Elementary School
Dow Avenue
Oakhurst, New Jersey 07755
(201) 531-6600, Ext. 365

Mr. Newton Beron
Project Director
Assistant Superintendent
Rumson-Fair Haven Reg. High School
Rumson, New Jersey 07760
(201) 229-4100, Ext. 260

Mr. Paul B. Winkler
Director, Education Improvement Center,
South
P.O. Box 426
Glassboro-Woodbury Road
Pitman, New Jersey 08071
(609) 589-3410

Ms. E. Cassandra Jordan
Director of Pupil Personnel Services
New Brunswick Public Schools
225 Comstock Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08902
(201) 745-5166

Ms. Dorothy Wriggins
Reading Coordinator
Glassboro Public Schools
Glassboro, New Jersey 08028
(609) 881-6366

Mr. Barry Lefkowitz or Dottie Donovan
Director
Institute for Political and Legal
Education
c/o Educational Improvement
Center-South
P.O. Box 426
Pitman, New Jersey 08071
(609) 589-3410

Ms. Susan Yudin
Acting Coordinator
Educational Improvement Center
N.W. Halko Drive
Cedar Knolls, New Jersey 07927
(201) 539-0331

Ms. Helen Hanson
Dale Avenue National Dissemination
Network Dissemination Trainer
319 Washington Street, Mall
Cape May, New Jersey 08204
(609) 884-2097

Ms. Barbara Pentre
or Ms. Hilde Weisert
Co-Directors
EIC N.W.
Halko Drive
Cedar Knolls, New Jersey 07097
(201) 539-0331

Ms. Sybil Nadel
Individualized Language Arts
Education Improvement Center N.E.
86 S. Harrison Street
East Orange, New Jersey 07018
(201) 677-9600

Ms. Jeanette Alder
Project Director
Principal, Roosevelt School
Louisa Place
Weehawken, New Jersey 07087
(201) 865-2274

Ms. Eleanor Russo
Director of Project LEM
Director of Elementary Education
Maple Hill School
261 Maple Hill Drive
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601
(201) 488-4100

Mr. Milton Knobler
or Ms. Arlene Schor
Project Director
Director of Art - Perception Plus
Union Township Public Schools
2369 Morris Avenue
Union, New Jersey 07083
(201) 688-1200, Ext. 257

Mr. Charles Murphy, Project Director
or Ms. Arlene Schor, Project Dissem-
inator Priority One: Environment
Union Township Board of Education
2369 Morris Avenue
Union, New Jersey 07083
(201) 688-1200, Ext. 221

Ms. Anita Schmidt
School #4 Annex
Dill Avenue
Linden, New Jersey 07036
(201) 486-3286

Mr. Matthew Scaffa, Project Director
or Ms. Janet Castellano, Curriculum
Specialist
Diagnostic-Prescriptive Arithmetic (DPA)
211 Daniel Low Terrace
Staten Island, New York 10301
(212) 447-3637

Dr. Frank Thompson
Project Director
ECOS Training Institute
833 Fox Meadow Road
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598
(914) 245-4009 or 6919

Ms. Joan Bonsness
Project Director
Northwest Special Education (NWSE)
Burke Central School
Lignite, North Dakota 58752
(701) 933-2532

Mr. John R. Rowe
Project Director
Curriculum for Meeting Modern Problems
(The New Model Me)
Lakewood Board of Education
1470 Warren Road
Lakewood, Ohio 44107
(216) 579-4267

Mr. Matthew Hickey
Director, Project KARE
Montgomery County Intermediate Unit #23
McGinnis Office Building
Route 73 and Butler Pike
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19422
(215) 643-7600

Dr. Russell A. Dusewicz, Director
or Ms. Mary Ann O'Connell and
Mary Alice Felleisen, Teacher Trainer
Training Coordinator
Project COPE
Educational Development Center
110 W. Rosedale Avenue
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19380
(215) 436-2517

Mr. Paul Gounaris
Alternate Learning Project (ALP)
235 Promenade Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02908
(401) 272-1450

Mr. William Dunklau
Project Director
Project SIMU-SCHOOL: Disseminating
Computer-Based Planning Resources
Through the Dallas Component
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204
(214) 231-6301

Mrs. Betty Warner
Project Director
SDR: Systems Director Reading
400 E. Spring Valley Road
P.O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75081
(214) 231-6301

Mr. Bill Gibbons
Project Director
Project HOSTS (Help One Student to
Succeed)
Vancouver School District No. 37
5802 MacArthur Boulevard
Vancouver, Washington 98661
(206) 694-1705
(206) 693-1775

Mrs. Carol Jackson
Director, Project Home Base
Yakima Public Schools
104 N. 4th Avenue
Yakima, Washington 98902
(509) 575-3295

Dr. Artie Kearney
Project Director
Drug Prevention Education
CESA #8
107 North Douglas Street
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911
(414) 739-1591

Mr. Robert Warpinski
Director
Project I-C-E (Instruction-Curriculum-
Environment)
1927 Main Street
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301
(414) 468-7464

Mr. Robert Schramm
Project Director
Strategies in Early Childhood Education
Cooperative Educational Service
Agency #13
908 West Main Street
Waupun, Wisconsin 53903
(539) 324-4461

The NETWORK

The NETWORK has been promoting growth and change in educational organizations since 1969. All NETWORK programs offer on-site, in-person services and emphasize local needs assessment, effective use of existing resources, formative evaluation for program improvement, and local curriculum development and problem-solving skills.

The NETWORK also contracts with local school districts and other educational agencies to provide assistance in such areas as staff development, evaluation, management skills, career education, and the development of individualized educational programs (IEPs) for special needs students.